This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

1837
ARTES
SCIENTIA
VERITAS
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BR
1
.C54

THE

71978

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI.

THIRD SERIES, VOLUME VIII.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
LONDON:
WILEY AND PUTNAM, 67 PATERNOSTER ROW.
1839.

CAMBRIDGE PRESS:
METCALF, TORRY, AND BALLOU.

CONTENTS

OF

VOL. XXVI. — THIRD SERIES, VOL. VIII.

No. I.

ART. I. — The Life of the Learned and Pious Dr. Henry More, late Fellow of Christ's College in Cambridge. By RICHARD WARD, A. M. - - - - - - - 1

ART. II. — Illinois and the West. By A. D. JONES. - - 17

ART. III. — Manual of Political Ethics. By FRANCIS LIEBER. - 32

ART. IV. — Thirteenth Annual Roport of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society. - - - - 54

ART. V. — Religion an Essential and Indestructible Element of Human Nature. - - - - - 77

ART. VI. — The Life of Cardinal Cheverus, Archbishop of Bordeaux, and formerly Bishop of Boston, in Massachusetts. From the French of J. Huen-Dubourg, Priest, &c. - 88

ART. VII. — Remarks on the Character and Genius of Sir Walter Scott. - - - - - - - - 101

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE. — The Hawaiian Spectator. Conducted by an Association of Gentlemen. Honolulu, Oahu, Sandwich Islands. — Sketches of Married Life. By the Author of "The Skeptic," &c. — Obituary Notice of Mrs. Grant, of Laggan. — Obituary Notice of the Rev. William Andrews. — Dr. CARPENTER'S Harmony of the Gospels. Second Edition. — Woman as she should be. By Rev. HUBBARD WINSLOW. Woman in her Social and Domestic Character. By Mrs. JOHN SANFORD. — The Young Lady's Aid to Usefulness and Happiness. By JASON WHITMAN. - - - - - - 122

EDITORIAL NOTICE. - - - - - - 136

No. II.

ART. I. — Life of Joseph Brant, — Thayendanegea: &c. &c. By W. L. STONE. - - - - - - 137

ART. II. — American Education. - - - - - 162

1. American Education, or Strictures on the Nature, Necessity, and Practicability of a System of National Education, &c. By Rev. B. O. PEERS.
2. Home Education. By I. TAYLOR.

ART. III. — Peace and Peace Societies. - - - - 179

ART. IV. — Life of Wilberforce. - - - - 191

1. The Life of William Wilberforce. By his Sons, R. I.

Wilberforce, M. A., Vicar of East Farleigh, and S. Wilberforce, M. A., Rector of Brighton.
2. Strictures on a Life of William Wilberforce, by Rev. R. I. Wilberforce and Rev. S. Wilberforce. By Thomas Clarkson, M. A.

Art. V. — Moral Rule of Political Action; a Discourse, delivered in Hollis Street Church, Jan. 27, 1839. By John Pierpont. 218

Art. VI. — On the Nature and Proper Evidences of a Revelation. 222

Art. VII. — Sixth Annual Report of the Trustees of the State Lunatic Hospital at Worcester. December, 1838. - - 247

Notices and Intelligence. — A Description of the Principal Fruits of Cuba. By F. W. P. Greenwood. — An Address, delivered at the Odeon, before the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism. By F. T. Gray. — The Women of England; their Social Duties and Domestic Habits. By Mrs. Ellis. — Address and Poem, delivered before the Mercantile Library Association. — Fireside Education. — The Poetry of Travelling in the United States. — Private Journal of Aaron Burr, &c. — New Works recently published in Germany. — Channing's Lecture on War. — The Atonement, &c. — Clay's Speech on the subject of Abolition Petitions. — Channing's Remarks on the Slavery Question, &c. - - - - - - - - 259

No. III.

Art. I. — The Power of Christ's Moral Character. - - 273

Art. II. — The Christian Citizen. - - - - 290

Art. III. — Slavery - - - - - - - 301

Art. IV. — Spirit of the Mosaic Laws. By J. E. Cellerier, the younger, Professor of Exegesis, Sacred Criticism, and Antiquities, in the Faculty of Theology of the Academy at Geneva, Switzerland. - - - - - 319

Art. V. — The Great Presbyterian Church Case. Hon. Molton C. Rogers's Charge to the Jury, in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, March, 26, 1839. Commonwealth at the suggestion of James Todd and others *versus* Ashbel Green and others. - - - - - - - 344

Art. VI. — Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature. Edited by George Ripley. Vol. III. Containing Select Minor Poems, translated from the German of Goethe and Schiller, with Notes. By John S. Dwight. - - - 360

Art. VII. — Travels in South Eastern Asia, embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China; with notices of numerous Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire; with Dissertations, Tables, &c. By Howard Malcom. - 378

Notices and Intelligence. — Mrs. Jameson's Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada. — The Moral Teacher. — Parkman's Discourses. — Monthly Miscellany, &c. - 405

Index. - - - - - - - - - 409

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

No. XCI.

THIRD SERIES — No. XXII.

MARCH, 1839.

ART. I. — *The Life of the Learned and Pious Dr. Henry More, late Fellow of Christ's College, in Cambridge. To which are annexed divers of his useful and excellent Letters.* By RICHARD WARD, A. M., Rector of Ingolsby, in Lincolnshire. Lond. 1710. 8vo. pp. 362.

IT has happened to Dr. More, as to many others, to be overpraised by his friends, and most sadly underrated by all out of that limited circle; to please the great public for a time, and then to be forgotten. At this day his writings are known only to the antiquary, or scholar by profession; and yet, in his own age, he stood high among the brilliant ones who, it was thought, would go down to posterity with their garlands on their heads, and their honors continually increasing. For twenty years after the Restoration his writings sold better than any others of that day; but now they are not to be found in the shops of ordinary booksellers, on the tables of general readers, nor even in the libraries of public institutions.* In less than thirty years his collected philosophical writings, making a thick folio, reached four editions, not to mention the Latin translation of all his works in three folios. As a testimony of the esteem in which they were held, a gentleman of the Inner Temple left £380 sterling, to procure a Latin translation of them, "that they might do good in foreign parts."

* We have sought in vain for several of them, at Cambridge, Boston, and Andover.

It is our design to do something to recall the attention of our readers to the life and writings of this truly learned, pious, and very remarkable man.

The work named at the head of this article is a singular production. It was composed in an age when good biographies were rare, and this is by no means the best of its age. It seldom tells you what you wish most of all to know. The author was a great admirer of Dr. More; he believes in his marvels, and venerates him as the chiefest of saints in those latter days. In his admiration he not only honors his mind, but even his body, and ascribes to it the fragrance of civet and rosemary. It is said a writer should always be in love with his theme; and, if this love were the only essential, our author would not fail to eclipse all preceding biographers, for never were love and veneration more absorbing.

Henry More was born at Grantham, in Lincolnshire, Oct. 12, 1614. He was the son of a man "of excellent understanding, probity, and piety, and of a fair estate and standing in the world." He was educated at Eton and Cambridge, at which latter place he graduated M. A., in 1639. At school, when a boy, he was distinguished for his remarkable proficiency, and "his teacher would sometimes admire at the exercises which were done by him." But this admiration gave little pleasure to the youthful author, for he always feared that he should never be able to do so well a second time. In his early years he was distinguished for that same variety and richness of thought which was so remarkable in after life. Piety, also, took early hold of him, and Reason and Religion stood side by side, and wove up the fabric of his tranquil life. His Christianity was of the same date with his Manhood. It is true, doubts sometimes troubled him. "But even in my first childhood," says he, "an inward sense of the Divine presence was so strong upon my mind, that I did then believe there could no deed, word, or thought, be hidden from Him. I think this was an innate sense, or notion, contrary to some witless and sordid philosophers of the present age."

When a child, at Eaton, he could "not swallow down that hard doctrine of Fate; on the contrary," he continues, "I remember I did very stoutly and earnestly dispute against this fate, or predestination, as it is called." His uncle, however, chid him very severely, and threatened a rod for his immature forwardness in philosophizing upon such high matters. But

Henry continued his philosophizing, and came to this conclusion: —

"If I am one of those that are predestinated unto hell, where all things are full of nothing but cursing and blasphemy, yet will I behave myself there so patiently and submissively towards God, and if there be any one thing more than another that is acceptable to him, that will I set myself to do with a sincere heart, and to the utmost of my power, being certainly persuaded that if I thus demeaned myself, he would hardly keep me long in that place." — pp. 6, 7.

At college, his zeal for knowledge was almost excessive. It excited the notice of his tutor, a kind-hearted and religious man, who once asked his pupil "why he was so, above measure, intent upon his studies? suspecting there was, at bottom, some itch after vain glory." But More answered, "I study, that I may know." "But, young man," pursued the tutor, "why do you so earnestly desire to know things?" To which he replied, "I desire to know, that I may know." — He spent four years in this way, in the study of the old masters in philosophy; and though he found in them "some things wittily, and others solidly spoken," yet they ended in nothing but skepticism. At this time he set down the state of his mind in a few verses, significantly called *Emptiness*. They are not the worst he ever wrote.

"Nor whence, nor who I am, poor wretch, know I,
Nor yet, oh madness! whither I must go;
But in grief's crooked claws fast held, I lie,
And live, I think, by force tugged to and fro.
Asleep, or wake, all one, oh Father Jove,
'T is brave we mortals live, in clouds like thee.
Lies, night-dreams, empty toys, fears, fatal love,
This is my life, I nothing else do see." — p. 11.

Then he began to suspect the knowledge of things was not the supreme felicity of man; or, supposing it to be so, it was not to be acquired by the reading of authors, nor the contemplation of things, but rather by purging the mind of all sorts of vices. He was led to this by reading the Platonic writers, and especially the mystics, who often speak of the "purgative course, which is preparatory to the illuminative." By their influence and his own natural inclination, — for the Mystic is rather *born* than *made*, — he became a devoted mystic, in the best sense of the word. He was especially moved by a little

work, so highly commended by Luther, called "Theologia Germanica," and particularly by that main idea of the writer, that we shall entirely extinguish our own will. — "That truly golden book did not then first implant it in my soul, but struck and roused it, as it were, out of sleep, in me; which it did, verily, as in a moment, or the twinkling of an eye." So he conquered the "selfish principle," and the divine became triumphant. His "thirst for knowledge was extinguished," and he was solicitous about nothing so much as a more full union with "that divine and celestial principle, — the inward, flowing, well-spring of life eternal."

But, when he attained this mystical union, he made a much more rapid advance in knowledge than ever before; so that, in a few years, he found himself in a much more lucid and delightful state of mind, and wrote a few more verses descriptive of his condition, which he called "Fulness."

> "I am from heaven; am an immortal ray
> Of God, oh joy! and back to God shall go.
> And here sweet Love on's wings me up doth stay.
> I live, I'm sure, and joy this life to know.
> Night and vain dreams begone. Father of Light,
> We live, as thou, clad with eternal day.
> Faith, Wisdom, Love, fixed Joy, free-winged Might,
> This is true Life, all else, Death and Decay." — p. 16.

He then wrote a long poem, called Psychozoia, the Life of the Soul, which was published a few years later, at the request of his friends. The poem relates "the experiences of his own soul," but it is of such a character, that it has been said, none but a Platonic philosopher or a reviewer would ever read it. In these earliest flights of poetic fancy, which are marked by all the obscurity and bad taste that so generally pervaded the poetry of those times, he sings of the Infinity of Worlds; the Preëxistence of Souls; the Highest Life; Virtue; Divine Joy; the First Good; Spiritual Beauty; the Platonic and Christian Triads; and the Perfect System of Optimism which everywhere prevails. His early visions of life, though caught through the windows of Christ's College, were bright and sunny. His thoughts on divine things were beautiful and deep. To him the world of matter was a collection of beautiful symbols, which fairly, or faintly shadowed forth the glories of the spirit world. The whole universe was to God what the body is to the soul, — its representative. Wisdom and holiness were to

him the noblest of possessions, and so, at the very beginning of his course, he desired "that there might be a turning after righteousness, no less than a running after knowledge. Therefore he set himself, with great care, to demonstrate the principles of natural and revealed religion, and to recommend the practice of morality and virtue, or, rather, the Christian or divine Life."—"He had," says Mr. Ward, "a wonderful sense of God," and soon came to see all his perfections reflected in the visible world.

He lived in an age of great men. Descartes, and Leibnitz, and Newton, and Hobbes, and Locke, and Cudworth, and Milton, were among his contemporaries. Several of them were his correspondents and personal friends. He kept pace with the discoveries of those illustrious men, and the advances of the times. He was not only learned in the lore of the schools, in the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, in the Scriptures, the Jewish cabala, and the mystical doctrines of all ages, but he had gone through the circle of sciences, and could dispute with Descartes on his favorite themes.

The life of a retired scholar is rarely checquered with other outward incidents than those which come and go in the battle he fights with poverty. But even these incidents are wanting in the life of Dr. More, for he inherited a comfortable estate. Little is known of the details of his life, which would interest the reader. He did common things like common men; and lived a quiet fellow of Christ's College to the end of his days. He was never married. He was often pressed to accept high offices in the church, but uniformly declined, and twice refused a bishopric. Once, indeed, he accepted a place, but with the intention of resigning in favor of a friend, which he soon did. He was once offered the mastership of his college, but declined that honor; not because he was unwilling to bear the burthen of its duties, but from fear he should not do so much for mankind as by pursuing his peculiar vocation of a quiet scholar. His life was a long contemplation, of which, both his works and the recollections of his friends are beautiful records.

Dr. More looked upon himself as one raised by God for a peculiar purpose, namely, to oppose and conquer the atheism, deism, and skepticism of his day. He even calls himself "a fiery arrow shot into the world;" and he expresses a hope "that he has hit his mark." His biographer calls him an Elias; but such an one "as mixed the zeal of Elias and the

law with the sweetness and temperance of the gospel; such an one, in short, as he himself describes. 'The spirit of Elias will neither abrogate what is authentic, nor introduce what is new; but will be a restorer only of what useful truths or practices may seem to be lost in the long delapse of ages. He will be no abettor of any useless subtleties, but of such things, only, as respect the interest of the kingdom of Christ.'" He lays great stress on the "divine body," in which, alone, he thought it possible "to live the divine life." He supposes the degree of mental perfection, and moral and religious life, to depend on the purity of the body. In this he agrees with the words of an apocryphal writer. "I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea, rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled," — for he believed the preëxistence of souls, and thought beautiful souls were united to beautiful bodies. Therefore, —

"The Doctor had always a great care to preserve his body, as a well strung instrument to his soul, that so they might be both in tune, and make music and harmony together. His body, he said, seemed built for an hundred years, if he did not over debilitate it by his studies. But, with respect to those, I have also heard him say that it was almost a wonder to him, at times, that he had not, long before then, fired this little world about him; and that he thought there were not many who could have borne that high warmth and activity of thoughtfulness, and intense writing, that he himself had done. And there was one thing farther observable, that, after all his study and depth of thought in the day time, when he came to sleep he had a strange sort of narcotic power, that drew him to it; and he was no sooner, in a manner, laid in his bed, but the falling of a house would scarce wake him. When, yet, early in the morning he was wont to awake, usually, into an immediate unexpressible life and vigor, with all his thoughts and notions raying about him, as beams surrounding the centre whence they all proceed.

"He was once, for ten days together, *no where*, as he termed it, or in one continued fit of contemplation; during which, though he ate, drank, slept, went into the hall and conversed, in a measure, as at other times, yet the thread of it, for all that space, was never once broken or interrupted, nor did he animadvert on the things that he did. And he hath been heard, likewise, unaffectedly to profess that his thoughts would oftentimes be as clear as he could almost desire; and that he could take them off or fix them upon a subject, in a manner, as he pleased.

Which things," slily adds the biographer, "are, notwithstanding, (I conceive,) to be understood with their reasonable qualifications." — pp. 41, 42.

Our biographer often indulges in such flights, instead of giving us sober facts, which are now lost forever, but which must have been familiar to him.

Dr. More had a natural inclination to enthusiasm, but he fancied he had completely subdued it, with all other passions of "the elder Adam;" but some of his readers will differ from him upon this article. However, his natural temperament, and his almost perfect self-command, gave him a great advantage in writing against enthusiasm and fanaticism, for he could speak experimentally upon the subject. Often, he says, in contemplating the beauty of the moral laws of God, and of the religious world, he was so moved with delight that he burst into tears, and was sometimes obliged, perforce, to turn his mind to other thoughts. This may remind the reader of Socrates, and the sages and seers of old time, who remained long entranced in rapturous thought. "Walking abroad, after his studies, his sallies towards nature would be unexpressibly ravishing." But he never gloried in his "visions," nor suffered his powers to be consumed in speculation. He said that "a notional apprehension of these high matters was worthless, without a sincere life and virtuous deportment." "Men would grow torpid," he says, in his quaint way, "by a mere talking of God's goodness, and the richness of his providence, without a solid improvement of it in mind." Yet most readers will think the following rhapsody is little better than a "notional apprehension."

"How loving, how magnificent a state is the mind of man in, when the life of God is actuating him, shoots him along with himself, through heaven and earth. This is to become deiform, to be thus suspended, (not by imagination, but by union of life, joining centres with God,) and by a *sensible touch to be held up from the clotted, dark* personality of this compacted body. Here is love; here is freedom; here is justice and equity, in the superessential causes of them. He that is here looks upon all things as one; and upon himself, (if he can then mind himself,) as a part of the whole."' — p. 48.

Again, he says, —

"God doth not ride me as a horse, and guide me, I know not whither myself, but converseth with me as a friend, and speaks

to me in such a dialect as I understand fully. For God hath permitted to me all these things, and I have them under the broad seal of Heaven. He hath made me full lord of the four elements, and hath constituted me emperor of the world. I am in the fire of choler, and am not burned; in the water of phlegm, and am not drowned; in the airy sanguine, and yet not blown away with every blast of transient pleasure. I descend, also, into the sad melancholy, yet am not buried from the sight of my God. I am an inhabitant of paradise and heaven upon earth. I sport with the beasts of the earth; the lion licks my hand like a spaniel, and the serpent sleeps upon my lap, and stings me not. I play with the fowls of heaven; and the birds of the air sit singing on my fist. — The dispensation I live in is more happiness, above all measure, than if thou couldst call down the Morn so near thee, by thy magic charms, that thou mayst kiss her, as she is said to have kissed Endymion. He that is come hither, God hath taken him to be his own familiar friend; and though He speaks to others a long way off, in outward religions and parables, yet He leads this man by the hand, teaching him intelligible documents upon all the objects of his providence; speaks to him plainly, in his own language; secretly insinuates Himself, and possesseth all his faculties, understanding, reason, and memory. This is the darling of God, and a prince among men, far above the dispensation of either miracle or prophecy." — p. 51.

Dr. More's life was mainly free from outward cares, and so he had leisure to give a generous culture to himself; to his mind, and heart, and soul. He educated himself that he might instruct others; for he said that, unless his duty to his fellows was done, he could never discharge his duty to himself. In the midst of what most readers will call his enthusiasm, or his madness, perhaps, for so is it wont to be named, he lived a model of generous virtue, and of an holy life. The words of Goethe will apply to him: —

> His eye scarce turned on the narrow earth,
> But Nature's unison his ear perceived.
> The stores which history brings, or life supplies,
> Joyous alike, his willing heart received.
> The wide dispersed did his great soul unite,
> And what had never lived his feeling fired.
> He oft ennobled what to us seemed mean,
> And our prized treasures were to him as nought.
> In his own magic circle he went on,
> The man most wonderful; and us he taught
> With him to walk, with him to sympathize. — Goethe's Tasso.

It may be said of him, eminently, that his conversation was in heaven. Yet, doubtless, there are those whose philosophy consists in knowing there is a selfish principle in man, — such as have lived long enough to see the folly of the world's wise men, the baseness of its high men, the meanness of its proud, and the littleness of its great men, who will say, with a sneer, that More's holiness could not have been so very holy, nor his heavenly-mindedness so very celestial. We can only regret they find so little in themselves to correspond to such emotions in him. Let it never be supposed that he suffered his religion to exhaust itself in rhapsodies. It was not so. He was filled with true love to God; and he displayed it not less in the kindest love to man, than in his lyric prayers, and sublime meditations. He was free from the petty ambition which disturbs the character of so many literary men. He gave himself up like an old sage to the sublimest speculations, and the most generous affections; and,

> "being innocent,
> Did for that cause bestir him to good deeds."

With him religion (the one idea of the man, *in* which he lived and had a being) was a sentiment which looked inwards to God, through prayer and silent meditation, and an holy intuition of things divine. It was also a principle which looked outwards upon man, and manifested itself in justice, truth, and charity. He sought wisdom, rather than knowledge; and cared less for a broad observation, than for an intimate acquaintance with truth. The high aim of his life was to understand the Divine Ideal, — the archetype after which man was created, but which no man perfectly represents; to conform his life to this First-Man, and to teach others to do the same. He was happy in his aspirations, for none can take a nobler aim than to be a man who lives by the "law of the spirit of life." Like Acestes of old, he aimed at heaven, and his arrow kindled as it rose. He was fortunate in his position, for his lot fell in the most stirring period of English history, the era of vigorous growth, "when there were giants;" a scholar in that stirring age, the age of Taylor, and Baxter, and those others already named, with many more, whose names come up thickly, at mention of these; — how could he fail to burn with thought? But of all the dangers of that stormy time he only shared the excitement. Was he faulty in this? If he had thrust his arm into the wheel,

would he have been more a man? To us it seems he would have done his duty more effectually. The scholar should be a man. There would have been a hardihood in his character, which now seems to be wanting. The life which his retired habits rendered effeminate, would then have been manly, or, at least, feminine.

"In a word," says Mr. Ward, "for what concerns himself, being freed, as he tells us, from all the servitude of those petty designs of ambition, covetousness, and those pleasing entanglements of the body, he had nothing to do but to exercise the most generous speculations and passions, and was to be moved by none but great objects. And, truly, what was his whole life spent in, but a course of retirement, contemplations on the vision of the works of God and nature, and a rejoicing at the happiness of the creatures that have been made by Him; in doing honor unto God, and good to man; in the clearing up of truth, and dissipating of error; in a word, in the universal promoting the true interests of peace and righteousness in the earth, and giving an example of prudence and piety, of charity and integrity, among men? He sometimes said 'he should not have known what to have done, if he could not have preached at his fingers' ends, for his voice was somewhat inward, and so unfit for a public orator.'" — pp. 57, 58.

He declined the labors of an office in the church, where, to a selfish man, the emoluments were vastly above the duties, that he might more eminently discharge the office of a tranquil looker into the mysteries of things. Yet he accounted man's life an action, and not barely a thought. Unlike most men of speculation, who are often one-sided, he never insisted on his peculiar opinions, knowing that what is peculiar to any man, is not only his smallest but his least worthy portion; for that which made him man, he felt to be greater and better than that which made him Henry More, and D. D. He cared little whether any man believed the preëxistence of souls, the infinity of worlds, and such like.

"It was life, and not notions, that he chiefly valued; and a single-heartedness of temper, beyond any theories whatever. All truths were to be realized as life, as well as remotely apprehended as doctrine. 'For my part, I am not fond of the notion of spirituality, nor any notion else, but so far forth as they are subservient unto life and godliness.' And he exhorts students that they never disjoin knowledge from righteousness, but that they ever prize such treatises as point a man to obedience,

and purge a man's soul from wickedness, far above those that do but vex his mind and consume his body with unfruitful subtleties." — pp. 63, 65.

At one time his visions were so bright, and the countenance of truth so cheering, that he fancied he should "have carried all before him" with his eloquence; but he soon perceived he was not destined to be popular. A learned friend wrote that young men "professed themselves at a loss to know what the works of More mean; and that old men, like so many Aristarchuses, fall foul upon your name, with their defamations, and censure and slight you utterly, as a person that is hypochondriacal." But he advised the Doctor to bear such things, for these men would rather suffer their limbs to be torn from them, than to lose their opinions. More comforted himself with the old adage, Philosophy is contented with a few judges. He was aware that if a man brings new things into the world, he is thought to design to turn it "upside down;" and if he speaks of things men cannot *see* and *taste* with the bodily organs, he may expect to be called "Samaritan," if by no harder name. Art thou greater than our father Jacob? it was once asked with no very singular emotions. Dr. More cheered himself with the thought that one day his visions should all be realized, and his unpopular opinions become the ruling ideas of men. He spoke his words into the frozen air, but looked for a more genial day, when they should be heard. Like the ostrich, he said, he had laid many eggs in the sand, which would be prolific in time. But his works will never be popular. No one of them will ever be reprinted; and only the painstaking scholar will have patience to cull universal truths out of the mass of perishable opinions, now obsolete. His *truths*, however, are still vocal, and it was always his prayer that his errors might "perish with him."* In these days no man believes his stories of witches and devils, of their intercourse with men in Wiltshire and Conway; his cabalistic notions and scholastic whims, which Bacon and Descartes shared in common with him. But every one who stoops at his fountain will rise a taller and a stronger man, with nobler aspirations, and a purer heart.

Yet he was not utterly misunderstood in his own day; nor could he be, when there was such a number "of latitude-men

* Might not an interesting and popular volume be made from his writings?

about Cambridge." Dr. Outram, a great man in his day, like many others who are now forgotten, declared him "the holiest man living;" and added, that whenever extraordinary prudence was needed, he never knew More to fail. Another looked upon him as "the most perfect man he knew;" and even Hobbes, Leviathan Hobbes, declared that if his own philosophy was not true, he knew of none he should so readily embrace as that of More, of Cambridge.

It may gratify the lover of small particulars to know something of the every-day life of Dr. More, how he did what every body does. For their instruction it has been recorded, by his biographer, that he usually dined in the hall of his college, except on Fridays, which, "being a fish-day, he kept at home." His drink was, for the most part, the "small-beer of colleges," called "twopenny." He named it "seraphic," and the "best liquor in the world." "But he was not, at times, without his farther refreshment of a better sort." There were two things, he said, he had repented of. The one, that he had not lived a fellow-commoner, at college; the other, *that he had drank* wine. To this latter expression his intelligent biographer gives an ingenious and shrewd turn, by adding, "He would have supplied it, I suppose, by the use of some other liquors." He was of a thin and spare constitution, but otherwise "exceedingly lively, and spirituous with it."

Dr. More always insisted on obedience to conscience, even in opposition to the opinions and commands of all men. If that said "go," he went. He pronounced its suggestions to be transcripts of the Divine will, as much as the very written law of Moses or Jesus. "If thou wilt be faithful to thine inward guide, thou wilt want no monitor; thy way shall be made so plain before thee, that thou shalt not err nor stumble, but arrive, at last, to the desired scope of all thy travails and endeavors; to a firm peace, and unfailing righteousness; and shalt be filled with all the fulness of God." Those impulsive suggestions he reckons as the innate seeds of all virtue, and the deep-working cause of all progress towards perfection, "which is as certainly forecast in man's nature, as shining in the sun." Old pagans could say as much as this. Hierocles taught that men see not the things of God, because they will not use this sense which is common to all men, congenital in all rational souls. "But, without diligently fanning this native, virgin flame," says he, "it will go out; the man will waver between good purposes

and temptations to evil, till he falls from stage to stage, and ends, at last, in the ditch." Constant obedience to this principle will lead the man not only to virtue, which is a struggle between duty and desire, in which the former is triumphant, but to goodness, where nothing interrupts the constant flow of rectitude and holiness. Then the will, which is the soul of virtue, has done its work, and retires from the field, and the pure spontaneous impulse pursues the easy way of goodness. Life is, indeed, a struggle between the lofty and the low in man, — between the fiery-winged steed, and the drowsy and rebellious brute,* which the Creator has yoked to the car of time; and when the former has proved his superior strength, and taken "the forward of the yoke," then the reins may be thrown upon his neck, and "wherever the spirit turns, thither the wheels turn also." Dr. More goes still farther; he calls man a centaur, a compound of devil and good-demon. Sometimes he seems to think that human impulses are all wrong, and can only be righted by taking a new nature from without, and wearing it till it becomes "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh." Is it not strange that men of his keenness of insight should think the masterpiece of creation was a failure, imperfect in its very plan, so that the whole scheme of the work must be changed before it can be "made perfect?" Has there been a "Fall," which has deranged the work of the Almighty? The dark view, however, which More took on this subject, was finely modified by his manner of receiving it.

"Behold, therefore, oh man, what thou art, and whereunto thou art called, even to be a mighty prince among the creatures of God, and to bear rule in that province he hath assigned thee, to discern the motions of thine own heart, and to be lord over the suggestions of thine own natural spirit! Not to listen to the counsels of the flesh, and to conspire with the serpent against thy Creator; but to keep thy heart free, and faithful to thy God. So mayst thou, with innocency and unblamableness, see all the motions of thy life, and bear rule with God over the whole creation committed to thee. This shall be thy paradise and harmless sport on earth, till God shall transplant thee to an higher condition of life in heaven." — *Defence of the Moral Cabala*, Ch. I.

Dr. More fancied he had supernatural drems and visions, like those of olden time; that a peculiar genius, like that of

* *Plato*, in the Phædrus.

Socrates, was appointed to guide him. "However, he was a little shy" in speaking of his good-demon. Indeed, he placed little reliance on communication with angels, admitting it were possible; and when some one boasted of "the felicity of such communications," he simply asked if it would make the man better, humbler, and more religious; and being answered in the negative, he drily inquired "wherein consisted the great advantage of such a peculiarity."

Unlike most men, we fear, he preferred thinking to reading. He was, at first, unwilling to relinquish his cool, tranquil contemplation, for the arduous labor of writing; and when one book was ended he resolved never to commence another. "But Divine Providence," says his biographer, "still cut out new work for him, as the old was done." In the midst of his course, when, to use his own words, "he was drudging like a mill-horse," he looked back longingly to the time when he read few books, rarely any, but enjoyed the quiet luxury of thought, with his mind turned in upon itself, seeking the "divine sense," which he preferred to the dryness of mere reason, and the wantonness of the most luxuriant imagination. He considered extensive reading an endless thing, to be endured for necessary purposes, but not to be compared with the divine life. He was a learned scholar, but still more a great contemplator. To use his own phrase, "he shut the windows, that the house might shine." He looked to the love of God to teach him the wonders of the law and the mysteries of Providence. Piety was his key to knowledge. Keenness of insight, he maintained, proceeded from purity of life. He sought rather to know the best than the most things.

"In the carrying on of his studies he had a great sense of the moderating himself aright in them, so as not to impair his body, or consume overmuch his spirits by them. And, for this purpose, he would give himself, at times, pretty large respirations and relaxations from them. Particularly, he said to one, after the finishing of some of his writings, humorously and pleasantly, (as he was happy in putting things into a lucky and sententious posture,) now, for these three months, I will neither think a wise thought, nor speak a wise word, nor do an ill thing. Yet would he complain, after all this care of his, that he found it one of the hardest matters in the world not to over-study himself.—When he was engaged in his exposition of the Apocalypse, he said his nag was but over free, and went even faster than he

almost desired; that, all the time he was writing that piece, he seemed to be in the air. [We fear his reader will adopt the same conclusion.] But afterwards he complained to a friend that he found himself *in domo lutea*, — in the tabernacle of clay."

In his early life he took some pupils under his care, whom he diligently and faithfully instructed, "giving them excellent lessons out of the chapter, read at nights, at his chamber." The Lady Anne Conway was a "heroine pupil" of his. She was skilled in natural and mathematical sciences; deeply read in Plato, Plotinus, and the mystical writers. She became a quakeress, and this circumstance caused her worthy friend great sorrow. She proposed several important queries to Dr. More, upon theological and philosophical subjects, to which he returned a long answer. Both are contained in this volume.

On the 12th of Sept. 1687, the Doctor ceased to be mortal. His death was, like his life, calm and serene. He foresaw it at a distance, and welcomed it when near. He died in the seventy-third year of his life.

He was tall of stature, and somewhat thin; of a serene countenance, pale in his latter years, though more swarthy in his youth, so that a friend called him a duskish diamond. His eye was hazel, vivid as an eagle's. "There was a playful wit in his heart." He had a soul for humor, and was habitually cheerful, and yet a veil of melancholy was at times thrown over his beautiful spirit. His whole appearance was prepossessing, — a noble pearl fairly set.

Dr. More's religion was calm and gentle. He looked out mildly upon the beautiful providence of God, and adored profoundly that wisdom which displayed itself everywhere. He lived the "divine life" with his fellow-men, laboring in their behalf with assiduous diligence, till his mortal course was ended. Few men have attained so great a degree of tranquillity as he. His faith cast out fear. His own character proved the words of the old sage; "It is the quiet and still mind that is wise and prudent." He has undesignedly sketched himself in a single brief sentence. "In the deep and calm mind alone, in a temper clear and serene, such as is purged from the dregs, and devoid of the more disorderly tumults of the body, doth the true wisdom, or genuine philosophy, as in its proper tower, securely reside."

But Dr. More, like other men, had his weak side. His be-

lief in witches, ghosts, apparitions, magic, astrology, and similar absurdities, is open to the censure of all. Estimating him from an ideal point of view, and comparing him with "the stature of a perfect man," we see great deficiencies and faults in this respect. It is difficult to conceive how a mind so wise and instructed as his could receive, as true, the ridiculous stories of devils who were *cold to the touch*, who danced by moonlight on the heath, and played antic games in old houses; or those equally ludicrous, respecting "dead men's bodies that walked," which he quotes from Curtius, and Albinus, and Schlichtingius. But it should be remembered, as his excuse, that all the men of his age, — all, even the wisest, of preceding times, had admitted the same foolish notions. Mr. Ward has well observed respecting them, "He may be said not so much to have attained the truth in this respect, as others to have fallen short of it." A volume might easily be filled with the "errors of wise men, which are the glory of dunces." Bacon believed in charms and amulets, Dr. Johnson, in ghosts, witches, and second sight. Boyle recommended the thigh-bone of a hanged man as a cure for a violent disease; and, nearer our own times, Dr. Rush prescribed cloves and mace to strengthen the memory. If Dr. More is to be condemned for believing what all his contemporaries believed, let it be a man without similar sin who "casts the first stone" at him. It is rare for a man to go a single step beyond his fellows, says a wise man; wonderful, when he takes two steps before them; but, to take a third progressive step, has been given only to some half-score of divine geniuses since the world began. We have sometimes dreamed that some error was necessary, in our infirm state, to preserve "a proper habit" of mind; for it may be that the mind can no more thrive on pure and unmixed truth, than the body can subsist on food, every particle of which is nutritious. Error may be the bran-bread of the soul.

Peace to the shade of this wise and good man! So lofty a spirit has rarely visited the earth. He had his failings,— nay, his faults, — but he was in the body, where the brightest light shines, "as through a glass, darkly." Vulgar men may laugh at some of his ridiculous tenets, and fools may "make wide the mouth, and draw out the tongue," at his credulity. Weak men may flatter themselves as they look on him, and say, "Aha, these were the great men of past times!" Be it so. Greatness of mind manifests itself by the possession of truth,

more than in the negative rejection of error. Tried by the latter standard, Leibnitz, and Newton, and Socrates, and Aristotle, were men of small stature, we fear. Let Henry More, then be weighed in an even balance; his errors in physical science be set off against his spiritual truths. Let his understanding be measured by his contemporaries, — men of lofty stature, — and he is a giant. Let him be judged by his life, and the spirit he worked in, and amid that circle of gifted and holy men we shall find few that were his superiors.

T. P.

ART. II. — *Illinois and the West. With a Township Map, containing the latest Surveys and Improvements.* By A. D. JONES. Boston: Weeks, Jordan, & Company. 1838.

THIS is a neat little volume of about two hundred and fifty pages. It was written, as the author tells us, "while on the wing." It contains, nevertheless, many pleasant descriptions and much useful and accurate information. These are merits which will commend it to those who are making inquiries concerning the West. Its faults, which do not harm it much, will speak for themselves.

In travelling a country but newly settled, there is far less matter for entertainment and instruction, suggested by its past circumstances, than is found in visiting the older portions of the world. In the latter, almost every spot has been the scene of some memorable event which the pen of history has consecrated, which has given a theme to the moralist and the reviewer, which has been wrought into the popular tale, or which has been celebrated in song. Hence there gathers round it a sort of classic interest, which awakens pleasing recollections, and affords useful excitement to the mind. But in the former nothing has yet been hallowed by immortal deeds. The past brings no contribution to the enthusiasm that may be felt. History, fable, poetry, lend no enchantment to the unpeopled scene. The imagination, if employed at all, must run onward, and paint what is to be; call into life the actors on this great

theatre; arrange the plan of their drama; describe their pursuits, their struggles, their dangers, their successes, their sufferings, their strides to power, their fearful ascendancy, their moral strength or weakness; and cause them to enact such parts as will hereafter make the yet untrodden soil classic and sacred.

The first thing that strikes the traveller on reaching the Western waters, whether the rivers or the lakes, is the jostle and rush of the moving multitudes of men, women, and children; and the number of steamboats, boxes of merchandise, drays, wagons, lumpers, and clerks with invoices and bills of lading in hand, with which the wharves and landings are crowded till no room is left. And his first question is, What has brought all these people hither? what causes this mighty flow of human beings in this direction? Let us stop a minute to answer this question. Setting aside, then, those who are mere tourists and those who are engaged in their regular business, it will be found that the larger part of this moving multitude have been driven either by misfortune, or by the straitness of their circumstances, or by oppression, to look out new homes. From the cities on the sea-board they are "going to the West," because in the revulsions of trade they have been overthrown, and despairing of being able to recover their former standing, and weary of the perplexities of business, they are resolved to spend their days in retirement and the tranquillity of rural occupation. They have gathered up the fragments of a wrecked fortune, and mean to make the best they can of them. From the agricultural districts of the old states, they are "going to the West," because the ancestral farms are not large enough for the support of the numerous family, and they want more room for industry, and more scope for the accumulation of property. From the continent of Europe they are "going to the West," because land is getting too dear and labor too cheap at home, and they feel that if they stay where they were born, poverty and oppression will be the only inheritance of their children. Besides these great classes, some are "going to the West" from a nervous restlessness of disposition, which forbids their being satisfied with any condition, however eligible; and others, from a passion for what is new and strange, from an impulsive desire to combat difficulties, from that spirit of daring which delights in bold achievements and perilous adventures, and which finds no play amid the regular and quiet movements

of long established communities; and others still, who, if interrogated, are found to have no distinct motive or object, but to be floating along and drifting about whithersoever the wind of circumstances may chance to blow them. These constitute, it will be seen, altogether a very heterogeneous mass, differing widely in tastes, feelings, habits, education, character; and it must of necessity be long before they will assimilate so as to form one complete and congruous body politic.

And what is the nature of the country to which such immense numbers are flocking, — this great Valley of the West? We shall speak of only what has fallen under our own observation, it having been our lot to travel over nearly the whole of the country about which Mr. Jones has written. Our remarks will therefore be understood as having particular reference to the State of Illinois. In its physical features, then, the country may be described in a few words. It is a region of great beauty and astonishing fertility. It would seem that the primal curse could never have fallen upon it. It is capable of sustaining a vast population. Its soil is so easy of cultivation, that a boy may do the work on a given number of acres, which it would require men to perform here. The boundless prairies covered with greensward and bedecked with flowers, in endless variety, which vie with each other in the beauty of their forms and the richness of their tints, stretching over unmeasured acres, in long and high undulations, skirted all round with tall forests, looking as if an ocean in the midst of a storm, by some inscrutable agency, had been suddenly converted into earth before its billows had had time to subside, — these constitute a large part of the territory; and they seem designed for a garden from which the inhabitants of the land might be fed; or for places of refuge, to which the poor and the down-trodden and the stranger might flee, when other resources failed them, and find plenty, rest, and liberty. God made them to invite the hand of cultivation,

> "And be the exhaustless granary of a world."

No one can think seriously of these illimitable tracts of luxuriant but uncultivated land, without being deeply impressed with the divine goodness; without seeing in them the provision of almighty love for the sustenance of his creatures; nor without rejoicing, that to whatever extent population may be increased and multiplied in this country, there will ever be room enough for their activity, and food enough for their subsistence.

The thoughts and emotions that swell the mind as one traverses these vast and beautiful solitudes are various and peculiar. One seems carried back to the beginning of time and placed in the midst of the primeval world, — another Adam sole tenant of the new-created Paradise. The forest that encircles him has never yielded trunk or limb to the axe of civilization, but has stood through the storms of centuries, bowing its mighty top to the winds and echoing the notes of the feathered tribe. From the long grass starts up at the sound of his step the sleek and straight-limbed deer, and stands gazing at him not in terror but with amazement at his intrusion; while the surly wolf moves off at a slow trot as if ashamed that he had been discovered. Here, too, he will see traces of the red men who have been driven so far toward the setting sun, and be called to remember how recently they shared with the untamed animals the jurisdiction of these wide-spread plains, roaming from grove to grove and from stream to stream without restraint, not dreaming that any human power could vie with their own, and with none to molest them in their simple pleasures and wild pursuits. For he will see marks cut by them on the trees yet looking fresh; the long trail extending for miles worn by their footsteps and by the feet of their horses, as free from grass as though they had trodden it but yesterday; here and there small patches of land which the squaws have tilled; and far to the north, on the scene of the cruel war waged against them five or six years ago, their bones and graves. We cannot help being saddened at the thought of the fate of these once numerous tribes. We can scarcely refrain from painful reflections, when we consider that within the period of ten years a large part of these beautiful and fertile regions was theirs by undisputed possession; and that now from the Alleghanies to the Mississippi and from the Ohio to the Lakes only here and there a few of the race are to be seen.

But let us beware of taking too narrow a view of this subject. It spreads over a broad field of inquiry. Ought, we may ask, this goodly land to remain forever uncultivated and unproducing? A country capable of sustaining millions of inhabitants, of feeding a hungry world, ought it to be kept in perpetual reservation as a play-ground for a few thousands? God in his providence has given the answer. His decree is that this Eden shall be cultivated; that these forests shall render service to the arts and be for the use and convenience of

civilized man; that these wild beasts shall disappear and the domesticated animals be seen to skip and graze in their places; that commodious houses shall take the place of wigwams, capitols of council-fires, and churches of Pagan rites. Civilization must expel barbarism. Rudeness must give place to refinement. Uninhabited regions must be peopled. The desert must blossom. And, in the end, the whole earth must become a garden beautiful, fertile, cultivated, man's resource for sustenance, health, pleasure, and peopled by an intelligent, refined, and virtuous brotherhood. For this result we hope. A careful observation of the ways of Providence justifies this hope. And God in the revolutions of time will accomplish it.

But besides these thoughts and emotions which are excited in the traveller by the view of these extensive and unoccupied tracts, there arises also the feeling, and it is vivid and often painful, of complete isolation. One feels somewhat as we imagine the mariner may who is cast away on some desolate island. He is cut off from all human sympathies. He looks wistfully round but can discover no traces of man. Man has not been there. Art has never known these solitudes. They remain just as they came from the hand of God. And though

> "Arabia cannot boast
> A fuller gale of joy, than, liberal, thence
> Breathes through the sense and takes the ravished soul,"

yet one feels too insignificant to be comfortable, too lonely to be satisfied. But to be in such a situation, for a brief period, has undoubtedly its advantages. It enables one to separate himself from all relations but that which the soul bears to the Infinite, and to view his being as a naked reality. It realizes to him, more forcibly than is possible in the busy walks of society, the Divine Presence, and makes him more intimately conscious to the pervading and animating influence of his spirit. And this feeling, how delightful is it! Nothing so delightful as that consciousness of the particular, personal presence of God with which the devout mind is sometimes indulged, when it seems to see the Perfect One, and to receive tidings of good and words of love from his lips; when, indeed, it is inspired and has a revelation to confirm its faith, to elevate its aims, to correct its desires, and to establish and vivify its spiritual sentiments. God then seems to fill the mind. God glows in the affections. The earth disappears. Material things vanish

away. Time, life, friendship, kindred, earthly good give place to the one absorbing fact, — the presence of God.

But it is time that we speak, and it must be briefly, of the condition of the settlers, particularly as it regards their personal comfort and contentment. The wonder is often expressed if they can be happy; if they do not suffer many privations; if they are not continually disquieted by a desire to go back! A just answer cannot be given in general terms; for what is true of one person or family is not of another. In some cases the privations are few, and the pain of being separated from friends and torn away from old associations is the only pain that is felt. In other instances the situation has been in all respects improved by the removal, and never before were they in possession of so many mere physical comforts, or in the prospect of so rapid and extensive gains. They left a condition in which it was hard for them to provide a scanty subsistence for their families, and now they have plenty, and all fear of want is forgotten. In still other cases they had been accustomed to live in splendor, surrounded with all the elegant and refined gratifications of opulence, and had known nothing of labor and hardship. To them a change of circumstances is, of course, a painful trial. They suffer for a while the most torturing conflict of feelings. They would so suffer anywhere; and more keenly, it is probable, by remaining on the theatre of their former affluence. For a few years their privations and hardships in a new country, and with new occupations, seem intolerable. But with the lapse of time they become used to their situation, interested in their new pursuits, and so strongly attached to everything around them, that no temptation could allure them back to the sea-board, to reëngage in the toilsome and vexatious routine of commercial operations. Again, there are many young men of tough sinews, of resolute spirit, of indomitable enterprise, who seeing that they have to make their own fortune in the world, that they have no patrimony to depend upon either in possession or reversion, have pushed out upon the frontiers, begun to thrive by industry, and laid a broad foundation for future riches; and to them the aspect of everything is pleasant. They cannot speak in terms of sufficient praise of their new home, and nothing would induce them to quit it.

But there are cases, as may well be supposed, different, widely different, from any of the foregoing. There are in-

stances of extreme suffering and heart-sickness. They are the cases of those who have left the place of their birth with little property, and no particular object in view. They are "going to the West." This is the most definite account they are able to give of their purpose when they start. They have not counted the cost. They have not thought of the difficulties. It has scarcely entered their mind what they are to do on their arrival. They leave friends, relatives, and a comfortable home. By a weary journey they, at length, reach the place where they propose to stop for the purpose of "looking round," as the phrase is. As the steamboat nears the landing, the family group with strained eyes, and beating hearts, and anxious faces, survey the new town, highly colored descriptions of which had first kindled in them the "Western fever." It does not look as they expected. It is not so large. It is not so well built. There is not the appearance of so much wealth. They do not see those beautiful streets shaded with trees which looked so finely on the map. Their first feeling is that of disappointment. They step upon the landing, entire strangers, hundreds of miles from any human being who knows them or cares for them. Where to go for shelter they know not, and all seem too busy to tell them. They sit down in the sand on the bank, the mother with her children in her lap and at her side, the sun pouring down a blazing heat upon them as they send back longing, soul-harrowing, agonizing thoughts to their forsaken home and their fond connexions, and shed copious tears over their comfortless lot. The anxious father walks slowly away in search of a tenement in which his family may be lodged. It is finally found; a single chamber perhaps, and at a higher rent than he had ever paid before for a whole house. The family enter it, and a chill, cold as death, rushes through their heart. Desolation, it seems to them, nothing but desolation! No neighbor comes in to offer friendly sympathy, to ask after their welfare, or even takes the pains to inquire who they are. There is a wide world around them and people enough, but they are alone! And now comes another difficulty. If the adventurer concludes to take a farm, he has, out of an almost boundless territory, to select the few acres for his own cultivation. He leaves his family and wanders off on foot to make the selection. The spot is, at length, chosen. It is on the border of an immense prairie just by the edge of the wood that skirts it, fifteen or twenty miles from any town or hamlet, and

four or five from the habitation of any human being. Since the flood no implement of husbandry has stirred the soil. Not a civilized man has ever tracked it. The wild birds have laid their eggs upon it; the wolf has made it his hiding place; and the deer his play-ground. After many struggles and much suffering they are once more settled in a home which they can call their own. But soon comes a heavier trial. One of their children falls sick, and there is no physician whom they can call in. There are no kind neighbors to watch with it when the parents are exhausted with watching. The child dies. And there are no hands but those of the broken-hearted parents to dig its grave and prepare it for the burial; and no minister can be summoned to utter over it the solemn prayer, and to offer the consolations of religion to the mourning household.

Having spoken at greater length than we intended of the *physical* condition of the West and its settlers, we proceed to state our views in the little space that remains to us of their moral circumstances.

It is not necessary to say much on the character of the settlers. That is, of necessity, mixed and various, as it is here. There is goodness and wickedness, great goodness and gross wickedness, in the new as in the older portions of the country. In respect to morals and religion the settlers may be said to represent quite fairly the particular parts of the world from which they have emigrated. There may be a slight balance against them from the fact that a considerable proportion are mere adventurers; but the difference is, after all, but slight; and without injustice towards any, they may be said to express the moral tone and religious character of the communities from which they removed,—no better and no worse. In speaking of their moral condition, then, it is not to their personal character that we particularly refer. But we refer to their opportunities of bettering their condition; to their means of improvement; to the moral incitements and restraints that surround them. We refer to the hopes or fears that are necessarily formed in regard to the rising generation, and to the influence which they are destined to exert on the country at large, in future years. And in this view of their condition, though we are not inclined to look on the dark side, the patriot sees much to give anxiety, the Christian and philanthropist much to lament, and much to do.

A New-England man cannot fail to be struck with the contrast to his own fortunate lot. When he thinks of the institutions under which he lives, — of the schools, in which his children may be carried forward almost without trouble to himself, from the rudiments of education to the highest fields of learning; — of the social manners and habits of the people, which shed a genial influence over the expanding minds of the young, imparting that delicacy of taste and refinement of feeling which constitute the chief distinction of a highly improved state of society; — of the public men and civil magistrates, who have made the name of New England illustrious by their integrity and learning and eloquence wherever these qualities are held in esteem; — of the numerous churches, the most graceful ornament of any people, where, weekly, the highest topics of human thought and interest are discussed; where childhood is taught to pray, and manhood to stand strong in faith and goodness, and old age to look onward to the renewal of its powers, and the rejoicing to give thanks, and the sorrowful to seek solace in God; — when he thinks of these privileges, he will bless God in his inmost soul that he has so goodly a heritage.

We can hardly realize, we who live in the more populous parts of the country, the great superiority enjoyed by us in point of intellectual and moral advantages over territories but thinly inhabited. It is a privilege never sufficiently valued to have had our birth where the earliest influences that fall upon us favor the development of the higher faculties and affections of our nature; — where, unlike the frontier settlements, the school-house and the church stand with ever open doors to receive us into their sanctuary, as soon as we are able to leave the nursery; where Custom, that great dictator in the concerns of men, that powerful engine for good or for evil, is generally found on the side of culture, refinement, education, in the best sense of those noble words, and throws the weight of her authority into the scale of social advancement.

Now, if we look at the situation of the extreme western states in these respects, we shall find it widely different. For, except in the larger towns, little provision can be made for the support of schools, or for the religious instruction of the people. The legislatures may have provided liberally, but it is impossible, so scattered is the population, to apply their bounty advantageously. The dwellings are so distant from each other, that if there were no other obstacle, the children cannot easily be

gathered into schools, or the people into religious societies. It is no uncommon thing to see a numerous family living at the distance of three or four miles from any other abode of human beings; and we recollect to have been told by an aged man, that during the year he had lived in the settlement where he then belonged, it had been visited only once by a minister of any denomination. It is from the multiplicity of such facts that dark auguries arise.

But it is replied to every representation of this kind, "True, these are evils, but they are evils which every day is removing. As population flows in, (and it comes like a torrent,) they are swept away. And such is the rapidity of increase, that even while you are writing out your statement, what was true when you began, ceases to be so when you finish." We may admit the general correctness of this answer. We may admit that the time is not distant when these evils will cease to exist. But it will be long enough for the rising generation to become men. And, alas, what men!

But suppose these evils removed, there is still another point of contrast between their situation and our own deserving attention. We found on coming into life, and our children find, the good institutions of learning and religion established and in full operation. We had nothing to do but to enjoy the benefits of them. Not so with them. There the institutions themselves are to be founded. The work which our fathers did for us, they must do for themselves. And they must do it, too, if at all, amid the press of a thousand necessities of which we know nothing, and in opposition to the passion for gain, which there, as well as here, is mistress of the heart. Subsistence and the multiplication of physical comforts, we know, are the first demands of nature, and for a long time almost necessarily the chief concern of frontier settlers. The supply of those wants which are felt most keenly, which press hardest, which will not be put off, engage their thoughts and energies to the exclusion of the higher wants of the mind and soul. Now, is there not reason to fear, when these things are considered, that there may not exist enough of the earnest religious spirit of our fathers in these their remote descendants, to prompt them, even when they shall have the ability, to establish and support such institutions as have been bequeathed to us? Nay, if these were all now levelled to the dust, would there be virtue enough even here to reconstruct them on the same broad and liberal basis?

Leaving now these general views, we would call the attention of our readers for a moment to the particular subject of religion; its state and prospects in the West. We are sorry to say that the spiritual aspect forms a melancholy contrast to the natural beauty of this fair region. The language which describes a desert, rather than that which paints a garden, befits its religious condition. It is true, and with joy we mention it, there are many souls there thirsting for divine truth; hearts which love righteousness, which delight in worship, and which cannot be tempted to forget the law of the Lord; individuals, more or less in every settlement, who are willing to do even more than they are able for the maintenance of religious order and worship. Let them be held in honorable remembrance. But generally, it may be said without injustice, there is a sad indifference, a torpor, a coldness, such as is felt in the limbs when life is about departing. In the outward life there is exuberance, activity, enterprise, merry-making, while the inward life is dry and shrivelled. Bigotry and fanaticism are there indeed; but what are they better than indifference? Skepticism, open and concealed, is there; but what is that better than moral death?

Now, what ought we to do as Christian philanthropists in view of this state of things? Observation and a somewhat extensive inquiry have served to confirm the conviction long entertained, that those views of religion to which this journal is particularly devoted, are better adapted than any others to meet such a case, and to reanimate with a divine life those who are spiritually dead. We believe that there is a *willingness*, (not choosing a stronger term, as one more sanguine might,) a willingness on the part of many to hear those views explained and enforced. It was our lot, if we may speak of our own experience without impropriety, to preach them in several places to respectable and intelligent congregations. We preached in the steamboat as we were pursuing our course down the Ohio, "the beautiful river"; and our hearers, of every shade of belief and unbelief, were silent. We preached for a month in a village of four hundred inhabitants, and had regularly nearly one hundred hearers. We preached in a church of the Campbellites, in a much larger place, to an intelligent congregation of rational Christians — Christians, who, with their brethren of the same denomination in other places, have done much for the cause of primitive Christianity, in battering down the antiquated

creeds which have stood as strong ramparts against it, in bringing all religious opinions to the ordeal of Scripture, in the zeal for Christ and goodness which they confessedly manifest, and in such blameless lives as force the acknowledgment from all who know them, "that they have been with Jesus." This sect, we repeat it, is doing much for the cause of primitive Christianity. Already the number of their churches exceeds a thousand. And they are, let it be added, in all the essential features of their faith, Unitarians. They have been diligently publishing our views without any knowledge of our numbers, our writings, our characters, or what we ourselves were doing. They have heard us generally spoken against as unworthy of the Christian name. As one of their leading elders remarked, "They had been accustomed to look on the Unitarians *as a genteel sort of infidels.*" We are not alone in the opinion here expressed concerning this sect. A respectable clergyman of the Episcopal church, when asked whether he thought anything was to be feared from the efforts of the Catholics, replied, "The Catholics are making great exertions, they are increasing rapidly, but the Campbellites are going before all others. *They are running over the West like fire upon our prairies!*" Besides the places above-mentioned, we preached several weeks in the great northern city of Illinois, to a congregation which increased regularly during the whole period of our sojourn with them; and never has it been our fortune to address a religious assembly manifesting a deeper interest in the truths delivered, or a more earnest desire that a ministry to proclaim and enforce those truths might be established amongst them. Here a society may be considered as gathered, and all that is needed to give it strength and permanency and a far-reaching influence, is an able and faithful pastor.

Our readers, we trust, will excuse these details of our personal experience. We could not in any other way convey the impressions which we were desirous they should receive. But still the question recurs, What ought we to do in view of this state of things? It is a question which we hear asked every day; a fact which shows that a strong desire is felt in this religious community to do something. What shall it be? It is perhaps to be regretted that no decided answer has yet been given to this question. A variety of modes have indeed been suggested for aiding the improvement of the religious condition of the West, and some of them partially adopted; but none

seem to meet all the wants. That which has most recently been proposed to the public, and recommended with confidence by individuals whose opinions are entitled to great respect, is the establishing of a theological school on the other side of the mountains, with the view of preparing western young men for the ministry, and thus of enabling the people to supply their own spiritual wants, so far as these may be supplied by religious teachers. We are sorry to dissent from the views of the friends of this measure. But we have strong doubts whether such an institution is wanted at the West, and whether any considerable number of young men would resort to it if it were established. If a theological school situated in the very heart of Unitarianism, in the centre of long-established societies, surrounded on every hand by churches from which our faith has been speaking for years in its most powerful and persuasive tones to the hearts of the people, amply endowed, with a learned and devoted faculty, finds but a few young men disposed to resort to it with a view to the ministry, is it not just to conclude, that a similar institution situated where Unitarianism is but little known, where the churches of that faith are few and have had but a brief existence, and where consequently its influence on the feelings and opinions of young men has been very inconsiderable, is it not just to conclude, we ask, that an institution placed in such a condition could not flourish? Again, we confess that we like the old-fashioned way of letting institutions of this kind grow naturally out of the circumstances of a people rather than attempting to ingraft them upon those circumstances. If the people of the West want a theological school of this description, let us see them moving in the matter; taking measures to bring it about; raising the funds; erecting the buildings; doing *something*, in short, themselves; and then, if they need aid from this quarter, it would be the part both of wisdom and of duty to afford it. But these are not the chief objections. There is another which has in our estimation great weight, and which does not seem to have been sufficiently considered; and we proceed to state it.

Whoever takes a comprehensive survey of the state of religion in this country, will see, we believe, that it is fast approaching the crisis of a remarkable change. The signs of this crisis are so manifest, that even the most dim-sighted must have observed them. The old bonds by which the various sects have been held together, it is evident, are almost worn out.

The elements of their organization are tending rapidly to dissolution. "New views," whether they make us glad or heavy of heart, are not confined to the Unitarian body. They have leapt over or crept under the iron fence of Presbyterianism; they have intruded into the dignified presence of Episcopacy; Methodism has been startled by the apparition at her love-feasts of the hated and prolific mother of all heresies, independence; even good old Quakerism, which once knew no communication but yea and nay, and cut all her garments so reverently according to one system of "clothes-philosophy," has been horrified by the rising up, within her peaceful inclosure, of a generation who disregard her ancient authority to such an alarming extent, as to use the profane yes and no, and to wear coats and bonnets corresponding with their new views. Everywhere the old ecclesiastical regime is hastening to an end. Every house is divided against itself. There is in each a new school and an old school. But this state of division is not, we apprehend, a final result. It is the order of transition. As it goes forward, (and forward it must go,) new combinations will commence on a new basis of union. The sects will be recast. Relgionists will associate according to their present prevailing affinities. Old names will pass away with many old things, and a new era will be introduced.

If we are at all right in these opinions, would it not be manifestly unwise to engage in any large undertaking, like the one under consideration, requiring much capital and great efforts, founded on the supposition that things are to remain just as they are? Would it not be establishing an institution designed to be permanent on a rolling and unstable foundation? For our own part, we think it better to wait for further developments; to observe the movements of the liberal in other sects; and when we see an opportunity for general coöperation in establishing schools, whether of literature or theology, to act then with an efficiency becoming disciples of the Christian faith. We are by no means certain, (may Dr. Beecher pardon the suggestion!) that a theological school already in existence, and justly distinguished by the learning and piety of its professors, although now under the ban of Presbyterian censure for its alleged liberality of views, may not be entitled to the patronage of the Unitarians of the West, and afford to young men of liberal sentiments as good an opportunity as they can reasonably expect for the study of theological science. Our conviction is

still more decided that a union for the general purposes of education, intellectual, moral, and religious, with sects professing liberal views, particularly with the Campbellites or Christians, will soon be entirely practicable; and if consummated, of the highest advantage to all concerned.

In the mean time, to answer more distinctly the question, What ought we to do? let us continue to send out preachers, as they may be willing to go, to strengthen the churches already gathered, to speak the truth in love where there are ears to hear, and to awaken the spiritually dead into the life of Christ. And let them be sent not merely as heralds of truth, to proclaim, in words that burn, the unsearchable riches of Christ, but as watchmen, with keen penetration to observe the significant changes that are advancing in that interesting quarter of the religious firmament, and to report them to their brethren here. Let them be, at the same time, counsellors to our distant friends who are anxiously inquiring what can be done to reduce to order and crown with light the social and religious elements, that are now in a state of confusion and darkness. They will find there enough to do; scope for all their faculties of activity and usefulness. And they will do much good, amply compensating their personal sacrifices and the cost at which they may be sent. But let them be men of power — power to combat error, to persuade, to convince, to please, and possessed of a spiritual energy that cannot be subdued by difficulty or opposition. Such men are wanted. Such men will be heard. In some places they will be received gladly. In all places they will be treated respectfully. For all men honor and admire manifestations of intellectual force, and stand in awe of a spirit that is moved with sympathy for humanity under its moral woes, and which exhibits in daily action the purity and excellence of Christian goodness. Let us do this; and let us send out tracts; let us write letters; let us be earnest in prayer, till the time to favor Zion is come, and she puts on her beautiful garments.

J. W. T.

ART. III.—*Manual of Political Ethics, designed chiefly for the Use of Colleges and Students at Law. Part I. Book I. Ethics, General and Political. Book II. The State.* By FRANCIS LIEBER. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown. 1838. 8vo. pp. 443.

A PUBLICATION on the subject indicated by this title is now happily timed. Important questions on the fundamental points in morals and politics are frequently discussed at the present day in our community with a warmth and earnestness, which show rather the deep interest the disputants feel in the argument, than their competency to decide the mooted problems aright. The contest is not only of opposite theories, the results are not merely speculative. Conclusions are carried into practice with ominous precipitancy, and sometimes it is well, if the decision do not wholly take precedence of the argument, and the debate be instituted only to afford a coloring to preconceived opinions. What are the bounds of the rights of individuals? How far are they limited and controlled by the establishment of society? What creates the duty of allegiance to human government, and when does this duty cease? How far are legal enactments binding, and when does resistance to constituted authority become a virtue? What positive duties are created by the mere fact of an individual's birth on one or the other side of a rivulet or chain of mountains, under this or that government?

These are grave questions; and it is somewhat late in the day to discuss them now with any particular reference to conduct. One would suppose, that they were answered long since, practically, at least; for the daily actions of every citizen presuppose a tacit determination of them in his own mind. But the times are changed, and we are changed with them. Novel positions of society beget new relations between individuals, and from these spring new rights and their corresponding obligations. New systems of morals and politics must be contrived, it seems, for each new phasis of government and civilization. We have done with discussing the divine right of kings, and, like good republicans, have now for a long time been determining the divine rights of the people. Nay, from recent events, it would appear that we have passed this point also, and are now to consider the rights of the individual, as opposed to the

claims of kings, governments, majorities, and all constituted authorities whatsoever. The great problem to be solved at present is, how to preserve the blessings of civil institutions with the smallest possible infringement of each man's natural right; — how to keep up society and yet impose no restraint on the free action of any of its members. The spirit of the present age is strongly marked by an impatience of all authority, however long seated and tamely acknowledged by former generations. As the subject-matter of all discussions in political ethics is thus changed, the old systems have become obsolete, and if any of the conclusions embraced in them are to be retained, they must be supported on wholly different grounds, and thus be assimilated to the other provisions of a renovated code.

The republican tendencies of the age have already been displayed in action; they have dethroned kings, emancipated colonies, and proclaimed deliverance to the captive and the slave. They are now to be seen in speculation. Theory is to be carried forward to the same point with practice, and perhaps advanced beyond it, since thought is naturally more free than action. Political science has thus gained a new point of departure, and must rest in future, not on the principles of absolutism and prescription, but on the philosophy of democracy, or the inalienable rights of individual men. The necessity of giving this turn to speculation proceeds from the impulse belonging to human nature, which impels one to seek in every institution for the idea of legitimacy, — to found every claim and action on some principle of natural right. It is not sufficient to enjoy a privilege; we must prove the rightfulness of the enjoyment, — the legitimacy of the privilege. From this cause, the movement, which has released us from the old political systems, now tends to the establishment of an excessive and licentious freedom. To justify the revolt against ancient institutions, principles have been advanced and a mode of argument adopted, which, as they are carried out by many reasoners, lead to conclusions remote and extravagant beyond all conception. "The right of the *people*" is a convenient abstraction; yet, in the apprehension of many, it means nothing, if it be not founded on the right of the individual. But, if each member arrogated to himself all the power, that is exercised by society in the aggregate, total anarchy would ensue. The theory, that government is founded on popular consent, in the

literal meaning of the phrase, is a mere fiction. The consent of more than half of the community is never asked under any circumstances, and under the most liberal form that ever existed, it would be difficult to prove, that, at any period subsequent to its first establishment, it is in the power of any person to withhold his approval, if he sees fit. Besides, he cannot give more than he possesses; and if the founders of the state could, by their personal authority, bestow upon it such extensive rights over themselves, then their successors, having equal endowments from nature, but disposed to make a different use of them, may withhold the gift from the government and exercise it in their own persons. This is a strange conclusion, but we cannot perceive that the argument of many ultra defenders of individual rights leads to any other result.

The state, as it appears to us in an organized form, is an artificial thing, — an arbitrary creation; yet it claims and exercises the highest prerogatives. It regulates the descent and distribution of property, and, under the name of taxation, even appropriates a portion of the subjects' wealth to itself. It is the arbiter of life as well as fortune, exposing those who live under its dominion to the chances of war, and inflicting death as a punishment for whatever crimes it chooses thus to distinguish. It even dictates to the consciences of those under its control, assuming the power to change the moral character of acts, and to make criminal certain proceedings, which, in a purely ethical point of view, are indifferent. Thus, smuggling is made an offence in morals, unless we adopt the strange conclusion, that a man has a moral right to disobey the law of the land, if willing to suffer the legal penalty when detected. These are all grave prerogatives, and the inquiry into their origin is at once curious and difficult. Every theory, which founds the power of government on a compact, either express or implied, or in any way recognises the consent of the governed as the *sole* basis of civil authority, necessarily implies, that the subject originally possessed these rights in his own person, and, unless he voluntarily renounces his birthright, he is independent of the law, and may rightfully refuse obedience.

We need, therefore, a more solid foundation for the authority of the state, than a mere bargain between it and its subjects. If civil subordination means anything more than apathetic submission to force, or blind reverence for ancient custom, it must be shown, that government rests on the eternal laws of justice

and natural right, and that its legal enactments are binding on the consciences of those to whom they are addressed. Allegiance is the moral duty of the subject, and treason is a crime of far deeper dye than the mere breach of a promise, or violation of a tacit compact. The duty is reciprocal, it is true; the sacred character does not attach to the government, unless the well-being of the subject is promoted by its management, or, perhaps, his wishes consulted, in some degree, in its formation. But, when these conditions are fulfilled, a more grave authority — a far higher sanction, belongs to the legal proceedings of the state, than could be derived from the mere consent of the governed. Hooker merely stated an undeniable truth in a rhetorical and exaggerated form, when he affirmed of positive law, that "its seat is the bosom of God, and its voice is the harmony of the world." This reverence for law is spontaneous and natural to every man, when unhappy circumstances have not compelled him frequently to oppose abused authority and mischievous and oppressive enactments. It is the safeguard of society, the preservative from continual dissension and tumult, the fly-wheel, that keeps up continuous action in the social machine, and protects it against sudden and injurious alterations. The presumption is in favor of every existing form of government, and can be rebutted only by positive evidence of abuse, mismanagement, or oppression. And the burden of proof lies on the assailant. He must substantiate his charges, or he is justly exposed to punishment as a disturber of the public peace. We are not stating a theory, but a fact, though it is one which is too frequently winked out of view in general speculations on politics. The uniform practice of all governments, in relation to resistance to their authority, is as above stated. The statutes of republics and democracies, as well as of despotisms, define the crime of treason, and annex to it the highest of all punishments.

In these times, we have reversed the maxim of the ancients; opinions now incline towards the conclusion, that the individual is everything, and the public nothing. The disorganizing effects of such a belief need to be resisted by argument, since the tendency of events is to strengthen and develop the principle. Antiquity fortifies the opinion of right in the state, and, as the frequent changes of modern times have deprived the civil power, in most cases, of this support, it is the more necessary to point out the legitimacy of its authority, or the moral basis on which

it rests. We are fast disarming the law of its former terrors,—physical force and the reverence due to age,—and there is more cause, therefore, to increase its moral efficiency. Without a clear perception of the truth, that the acts of the state are always *presumed* to be done within constitutional limits, there will be perpetual collision between the claims of government and of the individual. If the subject believes, that there is no obligation in the case, that he is bound to obey no longer than it is his interest to do so, that his own estimate of the expediency of a law determines his privilege of resisting it, then it is obvious that society must cease. An organized state differs from a mere aggregation of individuals only by virtue of the superior authority claimed for an act of the former over a decision by a majority of the latter. An act of the state, *as such*, by its own proper character, is binding on those of its subjects who receive and those who reject the evidence of its general utility. The privilege of the discontented is confined to an attempt to change the law through the established mode of legislation; they must not resist it during the period of its legal existence. But, where a number of individuals are casually united, without any social or legal tie existing between them, no decision by a majority, however great, can put any restraint, but that of physical force, on a single dissentient.

All general reasoning on this subject, founded on the hypothesis of birth in a state of nature, original enjoyment of entire freedom, and subsequent formation of society, and voluntary submission to legal restraint, is fallacious and irrelevant. Nowadays, men are not born in holes and caverns, apart from their fellows, to the enjoyment of natural, savage right. Man is eminently a social being. Society, more or less matured, watches over his cradle, claims him as her property in infancy, and exercises authority over him before he is capable of acting for himself. When he attains the use of reflection and foresight, the question is not, whether he will surrender a portion of the privileges he has hitherto enjoyed, but whether he will shake off the authority which has as yet restrained him;—not whether he will form a society, but whether he will destroy one. Therefore, if the duty of civil obedience exists at all, it is not self-imposed, but original; it is born with us, resulting necessarily from the condition of our nature, and the situation in which we are placed by Providence. The true state of nature, far from being one of unlicensed action and self-government, is a condition of responsibility, submission, and trust.

With these views, we may the more easily approach a question, the decision of which is of some practical importance at the present day. Does a colony owe natural allegiance to the mother country? Can it justifiably dissolve the connexion, when unprovoked by unjust, illegal, or oppressive treatment? According to the principles just laid down, colonists have no such privilege. The allegiance of the subject, as it is not founded on his own act or consent, but on the constitution of his nature and the general order of things, is due to that government under which he is born. It continues until he is released by a voluntary act of the state, or the duty is cancelled by some violation of his rights on the part of the government. It is the privilege of every society to use all justifiable means for its own preservation, and among the most important of these means is the integrity of its territory. Hence, the dismemberment of a state is a social evil, and can be justified only by the necessity of avoiding some greater wrong, or of vindicating some natural and indefeasible right. Indeed, so far as such a dismemberment goes, it amounts to a dissolution of society itself; for the right of separation from the main body may be claimed and effected, successively, by still smaller portions of the community, until, at last, all union is dissolved, and each individual assumes the privilege of self-government. The distance of a colony may seem to create a distinction between its case, and the removal of an integral portion from the parent state. But it is a distinction without a difference, when we regard only the rights of the two parties, though it may prove decisive, if the question be argued on the simple ground of expediency. There are no natural limits to the territory of a nation, and a district on a remote border may be as far distant from the metropolis, as a colony is, in a different direction. The duty of a subject cannot be determined by the greater or less number of miles which separate him from the seat of government. The inconvenience of extending the empire of one state over what are termed natural boundaries, such as a river, a chain of mountains, or an ocean, may be manifest; but this circumstance cannot affect a question of natural right.

In our country, under the most liberal government of modern times, this practical question may hardly seem to merit an abstract discussion. We shall probably never again be driven to an application of the argument in our own case. Yet it is important to have precise notions on the subject, if we would

avoid the waste of much honest sympathy on men and measures that deserve only the heartiest execration. Liberty is too sacred a name, the glory of having fought and died in her cause is too precious, to be thrown around the memories of piratical and blood-stained insurgents. To prevent a general confusion of ideas and uncertainty of judgment on this subject, and others growing out of it, and equal in importance, we need a system of political ethics suited to the advanced notions of the age, in relation to civil freedom and the rights of subjects, — a system, which shall reconcile the enlarged claims of individual liberty with the security and well-being of society. The first principle of such a theory must be, that government, considered simply as a government, is a good, — that its mere existence entitles it to respect, and gives it authority, — that innovators, recusants, and opponents are bound to make out their case — to show cause for their proceedings. This point being established, we have a moral basis for the reasoning, a point of departure in the natural obligations of the subject. The conflicting claims of the state and the individual may, then, be settled by a comprehensive view, on the one hand, of the blessings conferred on men by civil organization, and, on the other, of the evils of restraint, and the justice as well as the necessity of leaving free action and separate responsibility to each of the governed.

We hoped to find in Dr. Lieber's work, the publication of which has suggested these remarks, a full statement of the altered grounds of political science, and of the new position it occupies in consequence of the progress of civil liberty, and the enlargement and diffusion throughout the civilized world, of liberal opinions in matters of government. The rights and duties of citizens are now contemplated from a new point of view, and their relative extent and importance must, consequently, be determined on principles very different from those employed by former writers on the same subject. After a full examination of his work, we are bound to say, that these expectations were disappointed. It would be too much to assert, that the writer seems never to have perceived the necessity of founding his scheme of political duties on a different basis from that adopted by his predecessors; but, rejecting the old theory, he has offered none to supply its place, — none, at least, which, from a precise statement of principles, and definite application of them to certain cases, affords any solution to the numerous questions

contained in the science. There is no system in the work. The writer talks about everything, but determines nothing. If anywhere a distinct proposition appears to be enunciated, it is either deprived of all meaning by subsequent admissions to an opposite theory, or it is wholly subverted and set aside by contradictory statements made in another connexion. Indeed, we have seldom met with a treatise, — least of all, with one professing to supply the place of a text-book in seminaries of learning, — so ill-digested, wavering, and incomplete, as the work before us. The writer has evidently bestowed much thought on the subject. Some of the arguments bearing on particular points are lucid and satisfactory, and many of the illustrations are striking and ingenious. But there is a total want of method. We find no regular succession of topics, no consecutive evolution of principles; and, therefore, after the most careful perusal of the work, one is wholly at a loss to determine, whether the author has any system of morals and politics, or not.

We cannot expose the magnitude of this defect, without going into an extended analysis of the work, which would weary the patience of our readers. But any one, who will read a dozen pages in succession from any part of the book, will be fully sensible of the quality which we have reprehended. For particular illustration, to show what heterogeneous topics are discussed, and the want of arrangement between them, we give the author's own abstract, or table of contents, of one of the chapters in the second book.

"View of the Origin and Character of the State in the Middle Ages. — Dante. — Thomas More. — Bodinus. — The Netherlands first proclaim broadly that Monarchs are for the benefit of the People, and may be deposed. — The Development of the Idea of the Sovereignty of the People owing to the Jesuits. — William Allen. Parsons. Bellarmin. — Jesuits defend Regicide under certain Circumstances. — Mariana. Suarez. — Luther. Calvin. — Bacon. — English Revolution, a great Period for Liberal Ideas in Politics. — Puffendorf. — Leibnitz. — Montesquieu. — Hume. — Quesnay. — Turgot and Malherbes. — Mably. — Adam Smith. Blackstone. Delolme. Bentham. Hallam. — Revolution of 1830." — p. xii.

It would be harsh to find much fault with the literary execution of a work written by a foreigner, whose acquaintance

with English, as a spoken language, is comparatively of recent date. But there is little need of allowance to be made in this respect. The violations of idiom are not frequent, and the style, though irregular, is sometimes terse, pointed, and significant. Sentences of confused and awkward construction are occasionally to be found, but the defect seems to proceed rather from hesitation respecting the thought to be conveyed, than from inability to find correct expressions. For example:

"Our definition of liberty must necessarily depend upon the view we take of the state and its objects, so that the ancients sought liberty in something different from what appears to constitute the essence of modern liberty, a subject to which I shall revert on a subsequent page. *But whatever liberty may be — and it certainly consists as much in the absence of restraint and interference with actions which individuals may practise, as of that with which authority may limit my activity, in short, in protection, that is, protection against individual violators of my rights, against the elements, if they defy individual exertion, and against anything which interferes with my being truly that which I ought to be, as far as I alone cannot remove it — whatever liberty may be, it is of little political value to nations, unless something definite, distinct ideas embodied in palpable institutions, or fundamental laws, be meant by it; except by way of rousing degenerate generations.* In this case even a vague notion of liberty may be of much service, in order to throw the first spark into torpid hearts." — pp. 377, 378.

By a fashion not common among English writers, the book is divided into sections, many of them immediately accompanied by a body of notes, references, and illustrations, in quantity often exceeding the text. There is some convenience in this method, for works of research and detail, where it is important, that summaries and results of investigation should be readily distinguished by the eye from subsidiary discussions, proofs, and annotations. But the plan is obviously a poor one for a treatise on morals and politics, where it operates only as a temptation to swell the size of the book with irrelevant matter. Such has been the effect in this case. To fill the notes to a text-book on political ethics with long dissertations on the etymologies of words, accounts of sagacious Newfoundland dogs, wonderful feats of drovers, and malversations of people in office in Porto Rico, is a practice which savors strongly of the arts of book-making. Yet these instances are all taken from the first

sixty pages. The remainder of the book abounds with still more curious cases of the introduction, through these notes, and very frequently in the text itself, of matter wholly foreign to the subject in hand. The author is particularly fond of etymologies, of which we select the following, as one of the shortest specimens. Having discussed the Latin and German forms for our English word *conscience*, he appends the following note to the corresponding term in Greek.

"Συνείδησις from σύνοιδα, I am one who knows, is conscious of a fact. It is the form of the perfect with the signification of the present tense of εἴδω, ἴδω, *video*, I see, a verb never used in the present tense, and the remaining tenses of which form two different families, one of which retains the signification of seeing, the other that of knowing, so closely connected with each other. See Passow's edition of Schneider's Greek Lexicon, ad verb. ΕΙΔΩ, conscius sum. — p. 28.

What is the use of such a note as this, in the present connexion? If designed for scholars, it is valueless, for it contains nothing that may not be found in the nearest Greek grammar or lexicon. If meant for those who are not versed in the ancient tongues, it is unintelligible. The same propensity for an unseasonable display of erudition is perceptible in the numerous references to all sorts of books, from the "Library of Entertaining Knowledge," up to ponderous tomes on the Chinese and Sanscrit languages. A still more curious fact respecting these references is, that most of them are made to works which have nothing to do with the main subject of discussion. Where a criticism is introduced upon the doctrines of other writers on the principal topics considered in the treatise itself, it is often convenient for the reader to be referred to the particular passages in question. But if miscellaneous facts or anecdotes are mentioned, merely as illustrations, it is wholly superfluous to give the sources whence they are derived. If they were hypotheses, or supposed cases, they would answer the purpose equally well.

We notice these offensive peculiarities with pain; but as the author intends a continuation of the work in another volume, it is important that they should be brought to his view, and avoided in future. No qualities are so necessary in a scientific treatise, — above all, in a text-book, — as compactness and strict adherence to the proper topics of investigation. Some

experience enables us to say with confidence, that no demerits of a work tire and disgust students so quickly, as wordiness, a loose and discursive mode of remark and reasoning, and the introduction of irrelevant matter. The patience of the reader is exhausted by being compelled to an unceasing endeavor to separate the wheat from the bran. The scholarship of Dr. Lieber is undoubted, and such artifices as we have noticed were not needed to display the great range of his acquaintance with miscellaneous subjects.

Political Ethics may be defined as the moral theory of political conduct, or that branch of general ethics which treats of the rights and duties of citizens. The present work is divided into two books; one of them treating of the general scheme of morals, the other relating to the origin of society, and to men considered as members of organized communities. The first book, either from the limited space allotted to it, or because the author did not propose to himself a full discussion of the whole theory of ethics, is meagre and unsatisfactory. A better course would have been to omit it altogether. The omission would have injured only in appearance the completeness of the plan. The writer of the Leviathan had a similar purpose in view, but to execute it he was obliged to go to the bottom of the subject. He proposed to establish a philosophy of despotism; and his object was so peculiar and strongly marked, so repugnant to the principles of common sense, that he was forced to go very far back, and gain a standing point for his theory, by distorting and debasing the moral nature of man. The common belief respecting the ethical part of human nature was destructive of his political system, and he knew that this belief must be uprooted, before his theory could stand. Hobbes inculcated more slavish principles of government than the world, in all its unhappy experience, has ever known to be carried into practice, on the strength of an ethical system, that was utterly degrading and false. But there is nothing so peculiar in the present writer's views on political subjects, as to require a separate and distinctive scheme of morals for their support. They may be defended on any system of moral philosophy, which admits the fundamental distinction between right and wrong. Indeed, the book cannot be said to contain any peculiar doctrine in ethics, though there is much loose and general commentary on the opinions of various moralists.

The first principle in ethics is, according to Dr. Lieber,

"that man has an inalienable moral character, and cannot, by his own consent or the force of others, become a non-moral being;" a very safe assertion, though somewhat indefinite. In another place, however, we find this character defined to consist in "superior intellect, peculiarly expansive and refinable sympathy, freedom of will, and rationality, (or self-determination of volition,) and conscience." Undoubtedly, all these elements, in their turn, may constitute, in a greater or less degree, the grounds of human responsibility; since a being deprived of either would not be answerable for his conduct to the same extent, as one who possessed them all. But as each of them, separately, by different moralists, has been made the foundation of the moral character of man, it is necessary, in a system which embraces them all, to point out the particular office of each with great distinctness. Adam Smith explains all moral phenomena by the operation of the single principle of sympathy. Butler reduces them all to the workings of conscience. Dr. Price traces the origin of all moral distinctions to the intellect. Now, if an eclectic system is to be made up out of these several theories, the distinctive function of each element, and the mode of coöperation between them all, should be accurately explained. We believe that such an explanation is possible, though Dr. Lieber certainly has not attempted it.

In the first place, freedom of will is a necessary postulate at the outset of all moral investigations. The proof of free-agency belongs to metaphysical inquiry; it must be taken for granted in a system of ethics. With this point assumed, the next step may be taken with ease. A feeling or sentiment of the good, the right, the just, of duty and obligation, exists, just as much as the emotion excited by the perception of beauty, which, indeed, it closely resembles. It may be ill-directed, excited on wrong occasions, felt in an improper degree; but there is no question about its real existence or distinctive character. There is no more danger, for instance, of our confounding the moral approbation of a virtuous act with the admiration of a fine statue or a beautiful painting, than of our mistaking love for hate, fear for joy, or losing sight of the separate character of any two passions. We may fear the approach of that, which, when nearer at hand, will excite a rapture of pleasure. Just so, a savage may approve an act, which, in an educated state, he would view with detestation. But he would never, in either case, confound the two emotions. He would never

praise a wrongful deed as such, or blame an agent for an act of which he clearly perceived the virtuous character. The separate existence of a distinctive moral feeling is the substratum of our ethical nature, — the fact from which all systems must proceed. And this existence is proved by the consciousness of every one, by the criminal laws of all nations, by the vocabulary of every language; for words, corresponding to *right* and *wrong*, *ought* and *ought not*, may be found in every tongue that is or has been spoken.

When it has been shown, that a moral sentiment exists in all men, perfectly distinct in kind from other emotions, and absolutely superior to them in authority, in order to found an ethical system, there is but one other point remaining to be established. Do men agree with each other, not merely in the nature of the feeling, but in the character of the acts by which it is excited? This is perfectly similar to the question in æsthetics, — whether there is any standard of taste. In like manner, we ask, is there any standard in morals? Is there perfect unanimity among mankind in their estimate of merit and demerit, and in their award of moral praise and blame? Without conceding the whole ground here, we may safely attribute much influence to education. Those are evidently mistaken, who seek to explain the entire matter by the effects of early instruction. Education can never create a new emotion, though it may modify the direction of one, which already exists in the mind. The discriminating eye of taste is not gained without time and study, though the elements of it exist in the child's admiration of bright colors, smooth surfaces, and regular forms. But a brute could never be made sensible to the beauty of a fine prospect, for a susceptibility to this peculiar emotion forms no part of merely animal nature. So neither could a savage attain to a just appreciation of the relative importance of different virtues, though he intuitively separates right from wrong. He may frequently misplace virtues on the ascending scale, and therefore, when a conflict of duties occurs, may appear to make utter confusion between rectitude and criminality, though in truth, he has only judged wrongly of comparative excellence. The ancient Spartan esteemed patriotism a higher virtue than honesty, and encouraged boys in the practice of thieving, that they might become more able to overreach the common enemy. Modern intelligence has reversed this decision, and awarded immortal honor to the man, who would die for his country, but

would not commit a dishonest action to save it. The very mistake of the Spartan, far from proving his insensibility to the superiority of virtue, is of a kind that a brute, or a being having no moral nature, would be incapable of committing. The natural but untrained susceptibility of a child may lead him to prefer the bright colors of a daub, to the masterpiece of a Raphael. But who adduces this fact to disprove the naturalness and universality of the first principles of taste, or to show that the general preference of chaste coloring and correct design is merely arbitrary and conventional? Yet equally absurd is the reasoning of the sophist, who would deny the existence of natural law, because some savage tribes allow, and even encourage, great deviations from it in practice.

Examined in this way, the number of these dissentient opinions is much reduced, and the consideration of them becomes a secondary matter. We have hazarded these remarks upon them, because, from the space allotted to the subject in Dr. Lieber's work, and the number of instances adduced, he evidently regards them as a formidable obstacle to the establishment of an ethical system. The whole discussion is properly referred to another chapter in ethical inquiries, which relates to the criterion of moral conduct. If habit and early example have so great an influence on our estimate of motives and actions, if a conflict of duties frequently occurs, if complex cases are often presented, which need to be analyzed, before the course of virtue in relation to them is made plain, it is important to ascertain, whether there be not some common element in all virtuous conduct, which may be used as an unerring test of rectitude. Some writers maintain this problem to be solved by the discovery, that all the qualities of mind and action, which are generally approved as right, tend also to the order and well-being of society. Obedience to the moral law may often require self-sacrifice on the part of the individual, but, in its general consequences to others, must always be productive of good. Whatever is right, in the long run is also expedient. But, as it cannot be denied, that the converse of this proposition, in which form only it is useful as a rule, is liable to much abuse, some moralists have earnestly opposed its adoption. On this point, though it is one of vast importance in the theory of moral and political conduct, Dr. Lieber's language is wavering and inconsistent. We cannot perceive, that he espouses either side in the controversy, or has any fixed opinion on the subject.

An unfortunate prejudice against any reference to expediency in doubtful cases has arisen from an ambiguity in the meaning of the term. The only kind of utility, that can be used as a criterion of right, consists in the good of others, of mankind, — in the general good. To make private advantage, or the interest of the individual our guide, is mere selfishness. But it is the dictate of pure benevolence, to assume a watchful regard to the interests of our fellow-men, as the rule of moral conduct. We observe, farther, that the use of expediency as a *test* is a very different thing from assuming it to be the *principle* of virtuous action. It is only in complex cases, that we have any need of a criterion at all, and even then, we approve the act, not because it is expedient, but because its expediency proves that it is right. To resolve our whole approbation of virtue into that inward satisfaction which results from the appearance of utility, as Adam Smith observes, is to have "no other reason for praising a man, than that for which we commend a chest of drawers." But when we contend for nothing more than the invariable coincidence of virtuous conduct with the well-being of society, the remark, that the perception of utility is wholly distinct from the feeling of right, is true, but irrelevant. We avail ourselves of this coincidence only in order to detect one element by the presence of the other; — never confounding the separate emotions with which the two are properly regarded. Placing the question on this ground, the difference of opinion is very slight. It is only inverting the terms of the proposition. 'Whatever is useful, is right,' says the utilitarian; 'whatever is right, is useful,' says his opponent. There is little room for contest on the theory, therefore, though in practice the difference may be very wide. A single regard to the consequences of actions leads to short-sighted and illiberal views of the real interests of society, to a cold depreciation of remote and elevated good, and an exaggerated estimate of the importance of immediate and tangible effects. It is true, that these evils proceed from the abuse of a principle, which, philosophically considered and properly carried out, affords no support to such degrading opinions and conduct. But, if the tendency to such abuse be so strong, that nearly all the advocates of the principle have fallen into it, then the fact constitutes a well-founded objection to the theory itself; at least, until this last be so far amended, either in its nature or its application, as entirely to obviate the risk of misconception. On the other hand, there

is danger, lest a deep reverence for personal convictions of duty and rectitude, unaided or untrammelled by any reference to expediency, should generate a species of fanaticism in morals, that would be none the less turbulent and destructive in its effects, because accompanied with perfect sincerity of intention and the noblest spirit of self-sacrifice. The existence of this danger is not incompatible with the previous assertion, that all conduct which is right is necessarily expedient; for, though mischief cannot result from *absolute* rectitude and justice, it may from individual views and convictions of duty, which, as we have too good reason to acknowledge, may be mistaken and deceptive.

All will admit, that an action, wholly indifferent in itself and in connexion with ordinary circumstances, may acquire, from a change of position and from being related to a different class of events, a decided moral character, either for good or for evil. A responsible agent is then no longer at liberty, as he was formerly, to do or to refrain from doing, as the mere impulse of the moment may direct. The deed may spring from the same motive and be effected by the same physical movement; but, from the change in its relations, it now leads to a different result. He is bound to consider it as a whole, and to govern his conduct by the character of the event which he perceives must inevitably follow. To a rational being, endowed with the capacity of judging of the future from the past, the consequences of the act become a part of the act itself, and he has no right to direct himself by what is confessedly a partial view. Every one acknowledges this when the results are so immediate, that they are commonly blended with the primitive deed. Death is the *consequence* of the assassin's stroke; but is he not responsible for it? Can he plead that he has only struck a blow with an axe, and therefore incurred no more guilt than the simple artizan, who wields the same implement in his daily toil? This is an extreme case, it is true; but the consequences may become more and more remote by imperceptible degrees, and we may well ask, at what point the obligation to consider them ceases. When does the agent become entitled, in common phrase, 'only to do his duty in the act itself, and leave the consequences to an overruling Providence?' Certainly not, while he is able to foresee and provide for those consequences himself, any more than he would be justified in omitting daily labor, and relying for support on Him, who hears

the cry of the young ravens, and clothes the lilies of the field. The responsibility of the agent ceases only with his power. When the results of the action extend beyond human ken, when the wisdom of man cannot foresee their character, nor his power provide against their occurrence, then he is justified in leaving them to the goodness of Omnipotence. He is not to wait for absolute certainty in this foresight, but is bound to act on those reasonable grounds of expectation, a regard to which constitutes ordinary prudence. If he is not entitled openly to sacrifice the happiness of others, he has no right to hazard it.

Our remarks on the portion of Dr. Lieber's work, that professes to treat of "Ethics general and political," have been extended so far, that we have little space for noticing the second book, which should contain the application of his moral principles to the theory of politics. The want of system in this part of the treatise renders an analysis of it impossible; — desultory remarks hardly admit of abridgment. Our author affirms, "that the only axiom necessary to establish the science of natural law is this: 'I exist as a human being, *therefore* I have a right to exist as a human being.' This once acknowledged, the rights of men in their various relations as individuals, husbands or wives, (!) fathers or mothers, (!) as citizens individually and collectively in the state to other independent states, and to the collective citizens within the state, may consistently and justly be established." It is unfortunate to stumble at the commencement; but the foregoing enthymeme contains as palpable a *non sequitur* as was ever stated in print. To infer the rightful existence of a thing from the mere fact, that it does exist, is singular reasoning. Let us apply the same mode of argument to a different subject; 'immorality and crime exist; *therefore* immorality and crime should continue to exist;' — a conclusion, which Dr. Lieber surely will be in no haste to admit. It is fortunate for him, that his subsequent remarks on social and civil rights in no wise depend on the foregoing unlucky proposition, and, in truth, hardly contain an allusion to it; though it is here stated as the first principle of political ethics. To make a statement of this character, and yet to lose sight of it entirely in the reasoning which follows, is only one instance of the want of system, that is apparent throughout the treatise.

The second book opens with a tolerably fair enunciation of the question respecting the origin of government and the duty

of civil obedience. But instead of proceeding at once to discuss this important point, the author flies off in an idle digression about the institution of property. The advantages of this institution are brought out with some distinctness; but, as the whole inquiry is obviously of a secondary character, its introduction at this point only injures the connexion, and throws no light on the main subject. The consideration of any question relating to property obviously comes after the settlement or determination of that civil authority, which, if it does not create, undoubtedly restrains, modifies, and regulates the institution itself. Some remarks are made on the question of copyright, which has recently attracted much attention at home and abroad, and is now under discussion in the legislatures of several nations. As the most favorable specimen of the author's manner, which the present treatise affords, we extract a portion of the argument on this head.

"Because there was no copyright in early times — because there were no books, or books did not yield any profit to make copyright worth anything — it is believed by many to this day, that copyright is an invented thing, and held as a grant bestowed by the mere grace and pleasure of society; while, on the contrary, the right of property in a book seems to be clearer and more easily to be deduced from absolute principle, than any other. It is the title of actual production and of preoccupancy. If a canoe is mine because I made it, shall not that be mine, which I actually created — a composition? It has been asserted, that the author owes his ideas to society, therefore he has no particular right in them. Does the agriculturalist not owe his ideas to society, present and past? Could he get a price for his product except by society? But a work of compilation, it is objected, is not creation or invention. In the form in which it is presented it is invention. The ideas thus connected, though they are, separately, common stock, as the wild pigeons flying over my farm, are the compiler's, are preoccupied by him, and belong to him in their present order and arrangement. The chief difficulty has arisen from the fact that ideas thus treated, thrown into a book, had for a long time no moneyed value to be expressed numerically, and that copyright has therefore not the strength of antiquity on its side. Yet observe how matters still stand with regard to this right. Prussia has passed, only last year, (1837,) an extensive and well-grounded copyright law. In most countries, theatres may make whatever money they can by the performance of a play, without permission of the *inventor*, that is, they may use

my boat to earn as much ferry toll as they can. In the United States and in England any man may make an abridgment of the work of another, that is, any man has a right to cut the ears of my corn, provided he leaves the stalks untouched; to drink my wine, provided he leaves me the casks. Those nations who speak the same language, as the English and Americans, French and Belgians, and several of the German States, (with the exception of Prussia and probably some others,) have not yet international copyright, though they acknowledge other property of each other's citizens. It strikes every one, now-a-days, as very barbarous, that, in former times, commodities belonging to any foreign nation were considered as good prize, yet we allow robbing in the shape of reprint, to the manifest injury of the author. The flour raised in Pennsylvania has full value in Europe, and is acknowledged as private property, but the composition of a book, the production of which has cost far more pains, is not considered as private property. A regular piratical trade is carried on in Austria, and by Austria with other countries, in books, published in other parts of Germany. It was an ill-chosen expression in the British acts relating to copyright, that they were passed for the 'further encouragement of learning.' The legislature had, in this case, nothing to do with that subject, and Sergeant Talfourd, in bringing his new bill into the house, justly said, that it was for 'the further justice to learning.'" — pp. 132–134.

Dr. Lieber does not assert, however, that the allowance of perpetual copyright is the dictate of natural justice. But we believe, that this point may be fully supported. The opponents of the natural right rest their argument on the analogy between the making of a book and the invention of a machine. Yet the distinction between the two cases is perfectly obvious. The duration of a patent right is properly limited to a term of years, because it is very possible, that within this time another person may hit upon the same invention. No monopoly is justifiable, that deprives the community of an article, which they would otherwise have enjoyed. If Faust and his associates had never lived, the invention of the art of printing could not have been delayed for many years. If Watt had not effected his improvement of the steam-engine, our countryman Perkins, or some other ingenious mechanic, would doubtless have accomplished the same end. The latter cannot be barred of his right forever, because the former anticipated him by a short period; for, in civilized society, no rights can be enjoyed, that are not compatible with the equal rights of others. The natural dura-

tion of a patent is the time by which the first inventor has anticipated the second. As this period cannot be accurately ascertained for each case, an arbitrary portion of time is selected, that may be considered as the average interval between the first and second invention. But this reasoning is wholly inapplicable in the case of authorship, for there is no possibility, humanly speaking, that two men, without concert or knowledge of each other's labors, should chance upon making the same book. If John Milton had not written Paradise Lost, it never would have been written. If Shakspeare had not lived, Lear, Hamlet, and Othello would never have been represented. The public lose nothing, therefore, by the perpetuity of the author's privilege, for they are wholly indebted to him for the work; as they never could have enjoyed it without his agency, he has a perfect right to dictate the terms on which it shall be received. If he chooses to keep the manuscript in his desk, instead of printing it, they cannot wrest it from him. If he prefers to publish it, the act is a benefaction to the community, of greater or less value, in proportion to the importance of the work. But they cannot make the partial gift a total one, and insist on receiving the book upon their own terms; any more than they can take by force from the mechanic an article, which he has completed with his own hands, assigning him whatever value they see fit in exchange. The right of an individual to the products of his manual labor, and that of an author to the fruits of his mental toil, rest upon precisely the same footing; they do not abridge any previously existing rights of the public. By natural law, then, the exclusive and perpetual privilege of the writer is demonstrable.

Next to the question of copyright, in the order, or rather the disorder, of subjects in Dr. Lieber's work, are introduced remarks on civilization, the proper state of nature, the destiny of woman, monogamy, and patriotism. After many desultory observations on the topics thus strangely brought together, the author returns to his primary question,—What is the state? He defines it to be a society founded on the relation of right, just as a family is a society kept together by mutual affection. To adopt his own language, "the state is a *jural* society, as a church is a religious society, or an insurance company a financial association." It would be difficult to frame a more vague and fruitless definition, when the object is to found a political theory, and not merely to remark on the obvious fact of the

recognition of justice by societies as well as individuals. Church members and stockholders have rights peculiar to themselves, and perfectly distinct from those which they enjoy in their capacity as citizens; and one aim of the association in either case is to preserve these rights to its members. But this is not the only object of the union, nor is it the sole aim of the state to protect rights; its more general and leading purpose is, to promote the common well-being of its subjects. General expediency, not the mere enforcement of justice, is the grand motive for the institution of government. Even if we admit the correctness of Dr. Lieber's definition, so far as it goes, it leaves the real difficulty untouched. We seek to know the origin of that authority of the government, which extends over the individual from the cradle to the grave, — which follows him in his journeyings, controls his actions, regulates his property, commands his services, and, in certain cases, dooms him to imprisonment and death. We speak of its pursuing him in every change of place, for it is even disputed whether a man may quit his country, or the society of which he was originally a member; — Great Britain, at least, claiming the services of its subjects wherever it may find them, wholly denying their right to shake off the obligations imposed by their birth under its jurisdiction. But, if we allow this right, it amounts only to the privilege of changing one's allegiance, not of renouncing the duty altogether. The emigrant merely lays down one set of obligations to assume another; unless, indeed, he quits the society of men entirely, and accepts the inconveniences, in order to enjoy the freedom, of perfect solitude. But, if he prefers to live with others, the rights of the society take precedence of his rights as an individual. It is true, the authority of the state acknowledges certain limits; but the narrowest circle, within which its powers are ever confined, still embraces a wide tract, and the question respecting the origin and basis of these powers remains for solution. We do not know, that the full extent and difficulty of this problem have been perceived by any writer on natural law. Certainly, it is not solved by the author before us, though some theory in relation to it must form the point of departure for every system of political ethics. To assert with him, that "the state exists of necessity, and is the natural state of man," is to confound an organized community, which is a perfectly artificial thing, with a mere aggregation of individuals, formed by the social propensities of men,

but possessing no authority beyond that which is founded on universal consent.

We consider Dr. Lieber's work, therefore, as defective in a capital point, since it is idle to discuss the limitations of rights, before we have accounted for their formation. This defect is the true source of the vagueness and generality of the subsequent reasoning, and the general want of unity and system throughout the work. There is much loose speculation on the nature of different governments, and the distinction between primordial rights and those of inferior importance; but founded on no single principle, and leading to no definite results, the whole forms a heavy mass of undigested matter, the perusal of which nothing but the conscience of a reviewer could carry one through successfully.

The unseasonable display of learning, which is such an unpleasant trait in the first portion of the treatise, is continued throughout the volume. What is the use of framing such harsh and awkward compounds as *autarchies* and *hamarchies*, when the distinction they are intended to convey coincides entirely with the familiar classification into simple and mixed forms of government? The needless multiplication of such technicalities in a science necessarily limits the number of readers and students, and has a repulsive air even to the learned. In this case, moreover, the distinction is purely theoretical, since a perfectly simple democracy or monarchy — *autarchy* Dr. Lieber would call it — never existed; all actual constitutions combining in a greater or less degree the elements of those primitive forms, which, for the sake of convenience, are usually described separately by political writers. Absurd as the coining of such a term is, it does not answer the purpose; for even the etymological sense is not the meaning intended; the Greek word, which comes the nearest to it, signifying 'the very commencement of a thing.' Other instances of this pedantry, for it merits no better name, may be found in the long note appended to the thirtieth section, on the etymology of our English word *right*, and of the corresponding terms in other languages; and in the equally irrelevant annotation to the seventy-sixth section, on the titles by which the present reigning monarchs of Europe hold their thrones.

But our readers are probably weary of this extended examition of a work, which offers so few points of novel interest and importance. We have commented on it with perfect freedom,

not from any unkindness towards the author, but with the view of bringing plainly before him those peculiarities, which ought to be avoided in the threatened continuation of the treatise. The subject is an important one; and Dr. Lieber's various learning and great industry may enable him to illustrate it successfully, if not to strike out original speculations. But he must beware of putting forth to the public the immature fruits of his inquiries in such a shape as to weary out the patience of his readers in the beginning. His previous reputation will hardly induce them to make a second endeavor at the perusal. There may be really valuable matter in the book, but few will have the courage to seek for it under such a mass of desultory remark and cumbersome erudition.

F. B.

ART. IV.— *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.* 8vo. Boston. 1838.

PERHAPS there is no more remarkable feature of the present time, than the increasing interest which is felt for the most degraded portions of humanity. The injunction of the Apostle, to "honor *all* men," is beginning to be understood. A new faith is felt in the worth of the soul, — in the true relation that it bears to God and the spiritual world; and this faith is calculated to give a healthy and lasting vigor to the philanthropic movements of the age. It is this which is diffusing higher views of education, suppressing intemperance, establishing missions, pleading for the slave. It is this which is leading many to investigate the causes of crime, and which is transforming our prisons, from places of mere punishment, to schools of reform.

When we remember the immense number of males and females who are constantly in our prisons, it becomes a matter of vast interest to know how they are situated, what means are taken for their reform, and what is to be done to prevent others

from following in their course. Under such aspects the subject of Prison Discipline assumes great importance; it is closely connected with the welfare of society, and is never to be overlooked as one of the means of raising the criminal, from his degradation, to a true sense of duty.

The great object of punishment has been sadly misunderstood; more enlightened views are now beginning to prevail. Punishment is more and more considered as a means, rather than an end. One of its objects is to prevent crime. But how is this to be brought about? Not simply by punishing the offender, and sending him again into society as bad as before. Not simply by awakening such terror as to appal, and thus restrain, those who are inclined to offend. Effectually to prevent crime, we must go beyond this, and while we punish the offender, strive to reclaim him. The true way to relieve the poor, is so to relieve, as to prevent further need of relief; and the true way to punish vice, is so to punish, as to prevent further need of punishment. To extirpate crime we must awaken virtue. Branding with irons, and lashing with whips, have not, in past times, been found to awaken a love of God or goodness. To do this we must implant new principles in the heart, and call out feelings of self-respect and love of duty.

Unfortunately, Criminal Jurisprudence has not awakened that attention and anxiety which its importance has demanded. "The Criminal Law," says Blackstone, "in every country of Europe is more rude and imperfect than the civil." The reason for this probably is, that offenders have generally been considered as outcasts, — as enemies of society, — abandoned to vice and beyond hope. Few have thought of parental neglect, early temptations, and degrading influences, over which they had no control. Few have weighed the criminality of society in suffering them from infancy to remain thus exposed; and in this way, the very laws have been suffered to operate with little discrimination, and the punishments which have followed have rarely, until a recent date, contemplated the reformation of the offender.

The horrors and abuses, which have taken place in Europe, till within half a century, have been an outrage to humanity. Indeed, until a late day, in England about two hundred offences have, by law, been punishable with death. But a brighter day has dawned; and he who has read of the labors of Sir Samuel Romilly, William Roscoe, and Sir James Mack-

intosh, who thinks of the unexampled efforts of a Howard and a Fry, must have faith, that the work which has been so nobly begun, will come to a noble end.

From the earliest period of our own history, the attention of great and good minds has been more or less turned to this subject. William Penn was probably the first in this country who took any decided step towards reforming penal jurisprudence. Being opposed to the arbitrary injunction of the royal charter relating to the punishment of crimes, he drew up an independent criminal code, which was transmitted to England. This was rejected by Queen Anne and her council, but the colonial government saw fit still to retain it until 1718. During the time of Penn, murder was the only crime punishable with death, and every prison for convicts was made a workhouse. Under George the First, after much oppressive interference, the mild system of Penn was changed for one which rendered sixteen species of crime punishable with death. Thus things remained till the Revolution. In the constitution of Pennsylvania, framed in 1776, the legislature was ordered "to reform the penal laws, to make punishments less sanguinary, and, in some cases, more proportionate to the offence." In 1786 a new criminal code was created, and capital punishment retained in but four cases; but severe corporeal punishments, as whipping and the like, were still allowed. This called forth the strong censure of such men as Franklin and Rush; until, much through their exertion, in 1790, a change was effected in the laws. A prison was erected at Philadelphia, and the penitentiary system was commenced in the United States. This example, in 1796, led to the erection of a penitentiary in New York. A bill also, "for making alterations in the criminal law of the state," was brought forward, and became a law on the 26th of March, the same year. Previous to this time no less than sixteen species of crime were punishable with death. This law left but two, out of the sixteen, to be thus punished. After this, prisons were erected in various parts of the Union: at Richmond, in 1800; at Charlestown, in 1804; at Baltimore, in 1811; at Concord, N. H., in 1812; at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1816. Thus things went on, prison after prison going up, while the bad construction of the buildings, the bad management of the officers, and the almost criminal indifference of the public to the whole matter, rendered the prisons little else than hot-beds of vice, where not a weed was plucked up, and where every bad

passion grew with wildest luxuriance.* Old and young were thrown together, fifteen and thirty in a room, where they passed their time in card playing and profanity.

During this melancholy state of things, at Boston, on the 30th June, 1825, the Prison Discipline Society was organized, the object of which was to improve the public prisons. Accurate knowledge from personal observation was obtained. Prisons in thirteen of the States were visited, and the most judicious measures taken to ascertain the actual state of things. The abuses were indeed enormous. In Massachusetts from four to sixteen were confined in a room; in Connecticut, fifteen to thirty-two; in Pennsylvania, twenty to thirty-five. The young lad and the hardened villain were thrown together. Even men and women in some cases were locked in the same apartments; while obscene songs and licentious tales were heard at all hours. In many of the prisons, not the slightest provision was made by the state for religious instruction. The Scriptures were not read, and, at times, months passed without a single religious service. Governor Lincoln, in his message for 1826, in speaking of the prison, said, "the vilest schemes of profligacy are here devised, and the grossest acts of depravity are perpetrated." "Nature and Humanity," he adds, "cry aloud for redemption from this dreadful degradation."

The indefatigable Secretary and Agent of the Society has, by his unwearied labors, accomplished a work, encouraging to the heart of every philanthropist. By visiting prisons, collecting facts, exposing faults, suggesting improvements, he has probably done as much to reform prisons as any man living. His Reports, as has been well remarked, have been received as text-books throughout Europe. For it is an interesting fact,

* There is something very singular in the following account. It seems, indeed, almost incredible. "When the first attempt was made to preach to the convicts, the keeper reluctantly admitted the clergyman, though in the discharge of official duty, through the iron gate to a platform at the top of the steps leading to the yard, where a loaded cannon was placed, and a man beside it with a lighted match. The convicts were arranged in a solid column in front of the engine prepared for their destruction, in the event of the least commotion, while the first sermon ever delivered in the prison was pronounced."—See Vaux's "Notices of the original and successive Efforts to Improve the Discipline of the Prison at Philadelphia," &c., and Christian Examiner, 1826, p. 208.

that the improvement of our prisons has been such, as to attract the notice, and call forth the commendation, of the most enlightened countries of the old world. France, in addition to the mission of Messrs. De Beaumont and De Tocqueville, who published a volume of four hundred and forty pages, has sent another commission of three, to gather practical details, and make measurements and drawings, that they may put in operation a penitentiary on the American system. Dr. Julius has also been sent from the Prussian, and Mr. William Crawford from the British government.

The question now naturally arises, What has the Prison Discipline Society done?

1. We have alluded to the singular manner in which old and young, condemned and uncondemned, male and female, were thrown together. The operations of this Society have aided in bringing about a systematic classification. In 1827 it was found from investigation, that, in five states, one seventh part of all in prison were under twenty-one years of age, and some were even under twelve, and these were confined in the same cells with the most abandoned. Now, the old and young are not only separated, but different buildings are set apart for them. We not only have our Prisons, but Houses for Juvenile Offenders, our Farm Schools, Places of Refuge, and Asylums for the needy and exposed. Males and females are not only separated, but they are, in most cases, in separate buildings, and each have persons of their own sex to superintend their doings. Those also, who are waiting their trial, are now generally in apartments by themselves, and, in some cases, in buildings erected for the purpose. In the city of New York there has been an immense building erected, at an expense of three hundred thousand dollars, called "The Halls of Justice," or "Place of Detention," a portion of which is set apart for this purpose. This building contains two hundred separate cells, and is so constructed, that those who are committed on suspicion of crime, and for trial, may not only have separate confinement, but be committed, brought to trial, within the same building, and discharged, without public notoriety. It must be perfectly obvious, to every thoughtful mind, that those, who are only accused or suspected, should not be treated as if condemned; and not only so, but that they should not be thrown in together.

2. It has done much to prevent imprisonment for debt.

By exposing the cruelties which existed, by eliciting the opinion of philanthropists and statesmen, and by bringing the matter, in all its real deformity, before the public mind, this society has tended to open the eyes of men to one of the most barbarous usages of a former day. It has aided in abolishing those laws, which were a stain upon our statute books, and which too often brought upon the innocent the punishment of the vicious, and seemed to stamp misfortune as a crime. Fraud, wherever it is committed, should meet with its due, but inability to pay a debt, does not necessarily imply fraud; though the laws, as they have been, and, to some extent, still are, do not recognise this important distinction. Thus the unfortunate, who should have met with sympathy and aid, have been imprisoned and disgraced.

In 1829, the Prison Discipline Society, in their Annual Report, dwelt at some length upon this subject. During the next year, they sent circulars to a large number of distinguished individuals, to obtain their opinions; and these, together with many startling statistical facts, were laid before the community. At this time there were at least seventy-five thousand persons annually imprisoned for debt. About two thirds of the whole number were imprisoned for less than twenty dollars, and about the same proportion on mesne process; that is, without judge, jury, or witness, at the will of the creditor.

In 1831 a law was passed, by the legislature of Massachusetts, exempting females from imprisonment for all sums, and others, for less than ten dollars. This probably saved from imprisonment five hundred persons annually. The same year laws were passed in Rhode Island exempting all females from imprisonment for debts under fifty dollars. A law was also passed in New York, which probably saved from imprisonment at least ten thousand annually. In July, 1834, this was followed by an abolishing act in Massachusetts, which probably prevented the imprisonment of seventeen hundred or eighteen hundred, in a single year. The committee appointed to prepare a draft of the constitution of Michigan reported, that imprisonment for debt should in no case be allowed. In 1837 the laws, which authorized imprisonment in the State of Connecticut, were abolished by a vote of one hundred and sixty-four to sixteen. In Kentucky and Tennessee there have been similar abolishing acts. The laws in New York and Massachusetts have been of great benefit in the interior counties, but

there are exceptions in the laws, regarding transient persons, which still subject many, particularly in cities, to great oppression. In the city of Boston there were, during the last year, about six hundred imprisoned for debt, and of these about one third were seamen.*

3. One thing more, (and it should ever be remembered with feelings of thankfulness,) this society has been instrumental in causing hundreds of poor lunatics, who were suffering the most horrid cruelties in prisons, to be removed to asylums established particularly for them. The first asylum of this kind in the United States, which was intended expressly for poor and imprisoned lunatics, was that at Worcester. This institution, erected at an expense of over fifty thousand dollars, is situated on a singularly beautiful elevation, overlooking a wide expanse of surrounding country. It is probably as perfect an institution of the kind as exists in the world. In alluding to this magnificent asylum, the name of Horace Mann cannot be forgotten. His labors, probably, more than those of any other person, hastened and perfected this noble work of humanity, and long as it stands it will be a monument to his worth. The bill for its erection passed in 1830, and in January, 1833, the Governor issued a proclamation, requiring the removal to it of all lunatics confined in jails and houses of correction, throughout the commonwealth.

This unfortunate class of our fellow-creatures were, until that time, often treated with such brutal severity, that their case became one of almost unmitigated woe. Whereas they are now placed in the midst of soothing influences, and, in cases where reason is not restored, they are surrounded by every comfort, and live comparatively happy.

Formerly, while in jails and houses of correction, the insane seldom or never recovered; they generally became worse; now it appears by the report of the superintendent that eighty-nine per cent. of cases of less than one year's duration, and more than twenty-five per cent. of old cases, have been cured.

---

* "There is reason to apprehend that the greatest abuses exist in this connexion; and that the jails in this Commonwealth are habitually made a part of the machinery by which seamen are cruelly defrauded of their hard earnings;" and the extraordinary results made known by the abstract of the returns prepared by the Secretary of State "seem to show the necessity of some farther laws to carry into effect the purpose of the legislature, and especially to extend its operation to that class of the community most exposed to hardships in this respect, — I mean our seafaring brethren." — Gov. Everett's Address, Jan. 1839.

There is another interesting feature of lunatic asylums, as they are now conducted, which we cannot pass by in silence. Connected with these institutions are chapels for worship, and persons who have not been present in a church, or attended religious services, for ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty, and, in more than one instance, thirty-five years, now attend regularly, and conduct themselves with the greatest decorum.

"Can we contemplate," says Dr. Woodward, "a more interesting spectacle than the assembly of the insane, a large proportion of whom had been incarcerated for years in prisons and in dungeons, or confined with chains and manacles, the objects of terror and dread to all around them, convened on the Sabbath for public worship, all decently clad, and respectable in appearance, calm and self-possessed, listening with apparent attention to the messages of truth, uniting in the devotions, and joining in the songs of praise; all going and returning from the chapel with order? Such a spectacle we have witnessed on each returning Sabbath, since our chapel was consecrated."

The work is going on. The states of Maine and Vermont are erecting asylums on an extensive scale, for which large appropriations have been made. The state of New York is erecting buildings which will accommodate one thousand patients. The corporations of New York and of Boston are erecting buildings for the insane of those cities. The legislature of Ohio has appropriated forty thousand dollars for erecting an institution at Columbus. One has been recently established in Kentucky, for pauper lunatics, at an expense of thirty thousand dollars. South Carolina has expended one hundred thousand dollars for the erection of a state asylum at Columbia, and is now making large additions to it. Virginia has two hospitals for the insane; one at Williamsburgh, and one at Staunton. Tennessee has recently erected an asylum at Nashville. Thus this noble work of philanthropy goes forward; and the Prison Discipline Society has been, without doubt, greatly instrumental in hastening it.

The society, we may also add, in passing, has done much in regard to penal laws. It has called forth a truer feeling towards convicts, and furnished statistical information of immense value.

One of the most important things, connected with the subject of Prison Discipline, is the controversy respecting the Pennsyl-

vania and the Auburn systems. Each system is advocated by men of eminent piety and judgment. Many weighty arguments are brought forward on both sides. It is not our purpose, at this time, to enter into the merits of either minutely. It is a question of great importance, and should be entered upon with profound thought and thorough investigation. Both plans are in a measure experiments, and both may have their faults. In all such differences, it is desirable that there should be perfect candor, and that the desire should not be so strong to support a system, as to discover truth.

Much is said about expense, and this, no doubt, should be considered; but if it can be clearly proved that the greatest expense is connected with the best plan, the expense becomes a matter of comparatively small consequence. If, on the other hand, the best plan is also cheapest, this is, of course, an additional argument in its favor. To erect a penitentiary on the Pennsylvania system costs six or seven times as much as to build one of the same capacity on the Auburn plan. But the great question remains, Is the Pennsylvania system better calculated to reform the convict, and enable him to become a worthy member of society? We are not satisfied that it is so. Facts seem to be in favor of the Auburn system. With regard to recommitments, the accounts from Philadelphia are not very satisfactory. Out of 420, — the whole number discharged and pardoned in four years, — 41 were recommitted, or 1 to 10¼. At Auburn of all discharged, the number of recommitments has been 1 to 12½, for a period of twenty years.

It is well known that the Pennsylvania system is one of solitary confinement, day and night. In their small cells they remain, until released from prison. The principle that this goes upon is, that solitude will lead the mind to reflect, and reflection will lead it to virtue. But does not this depend in some measure upon the mind itself? If a mind has been enlightened, if its better powers have been called forth, if pure thoughts have been cherished, then, after moments of sin, solitude may lead to reflection, and reflection to virtue. But if you should take an ignorant man, whose mind has been neglected, who has been long in the habit of associating with the vicious, whose animal passions are strong, and whose recollections go back only to scenes of lust and sin, and place him in utter solitude, would not the effect be somewhat different? Might it not increase his passions, or stupify his mind? And what are the

characters of those who are generally imprisoned? It is well known that they are in most cases unfortunate, uneducated victims of neglect; that they are often low and sensual. And if we look philosophically at the probable consequence of solitary confinement on such persons, by night and by day, month after month, and year after year, what are our natural conclusions?

In the Auburn system there are daily prayers, when all are assembled in the chapel; there are also Sunday schools and religious services on the Sabbath. In the Pennsylvania prison the inmates are never assembled. They have no chapel. They are never brought together for instruction; they must be conversed with separately, or the speaker must stand in the long stone passage way, without seeing a single person, and let his voice be heard through the small holes cut in the doors of their cells. This latter mode would seem to be painfully unnatural. So much so, that one is led almost impatiently to ask, why not let them assemble, at least on the Lord's day? But this would violate the great principle upon which their whole system is founded, which is, that as it is desirable that the convict should not know, or be known by, any fellow-convict after release, therefore that no inmate shall see the face of another while in the prison. There is certainly good in this plan, but, to carry it out, much that is good must be sacrificed; so much, that one may well question its wisdom. The theory effectually debars the prisoners from ever being brought together either for work, mutual instruction, or worship.

It is also objected by many, that the health of the prisoners is greatly injured by being thus immured in utter solitude.* While, on the other hand, the friends of the system state that they are satisfied with the health of the convicts; that the bad

* The number of sick, according to the Reports of the Pennsylvania prison, is generally three per cent. The number under the Auburn, two per cent. According to the Ninth Report of the New Penitentiary in Philadelphia, it appears that there were seventeen deaths out of three hundred and eighty-seven, or more than four per cent. In the Auburn prison there are hospitals for the sick, with every necessary comfort. The sick in the Philadelphia prison must remain in their cells, and if they die, die in solitude.

It may be well here to refer to a pamphlet of ninety pages, just published by Dr. Ch. Condet of Geneva, Switzerland, who is physician of the Penitentiary of that place, in which he maintains that the Pennsylvania system is not favorable to health.

effect of being constantly confined to the cells is more than counteracted by the visits of advising friends; and that, with regard to assembling for worship, they are opposed to it on principle; that all that the convicts need is private instruction.

There are many things connected with these two systems, which are important, and, in regard to which, wise and good men differ. It seems to us very important, that there should be a friendly and candid spirit between the friends of the two systems, that each should be willing to acknowledge defects, on whichever side they may be found, and that there should always be a wish to aid and assist each other in sifting the bad from the good; so that a system may gradually be brought out, which will give satisfaction to every Christian mind.

Let us now look at the internal discipline of prisons. First, in order to prevent all evil communication, the rule is, to allow no conversation. And, while speaking of this, it may be well to observe, that, although in the Pennsylvania prison all are kept constantly in their cells, it is unqualifiedly stated, by many who have examined the prison, that the prisoners can converse with each other; and this has been stated so often, and by such good authority, that we believe there is no doubt of the fact. They can speak through the pipes and ventilators, and over the walls of the yards. In the Auburn prisons they use the greatest caution to prevent conversation. When the prisoners leave their cells, for the workshops, they walk in single file, with an overseer to about every twenty, and under the care of these overseers they continue through the day. There may very likely, at times, be an exchange of signs or words; we should think it impossible wholly to prevent it; but we believe that no long continued conversation can ever take place, and that, as a general thing, there is little or no conversation during the whole time of imprisonment.*

The next thing, upon which we would speak, is labor. In the Pennsylvania prison work must be done at great disadvantage. Occupations, which require more than one person, cannot, of course, be carried on, and the time of labor must be at the discretion of the inmate. Under the Auburn system there

* Dr. Lieber has lately published a pamphlet, advocating the Pennsylvania system. On the other hand, the Secretary of the Prison Discipline Society, in his Annual Reports, speaks with great earnestness against the system, and considers it fraught with evil.

is a regular course of labor. All, except the sick, are obliged to work, and the hum of industry is heard at every hour of the day. The hatter, the carpenter, the shoemaker, the blacksmith, the brass-founder, the stone-cutter, all find enough to do. Lessons of industry are learned. Habits of constant activity are acquired, and the means of gaining an honest livelihood in after life are thus put in the hands of each. Still, while there is great good in all this, there are also accompanying dangers. Instead of the prisons being an expense to the State, they are becoming sources of income, and there appears to be a competition among the prisons, as to which will earn the most; so that many may think more of the daily earnings, than of the prisoner's reformation. There is great danger of this, and we are confident that some of our largest prisons have erred grievously in this respect.

In the New Hampshire prison, the prisoners work for contractors, who bind themselves to support the institution, on condition that they are to have all the remaining profits. Of this system, Mr. Pilsbury, who is high authority, says, "although I wish to hurt no one's feelings, it is the worst of all systems, and has a direct tendency to destroy all the good that is contemplated by the friends of prison discipline." — *Report*, 1838, p. 31.

The State prison in Vermont has made a similar contract for three years. The new penitentiary in Tennessee has earned, during the last two years, with only one hundred and twenty-two prisoners, fourteen thousand four hundred and thirty dollars, above expenses. The committee of the legislature suggest the propriety of adding such surplus as may be in the hands of the keeper, from time to time, to the common-school funds. This they suggest, although, in the report for the last two years, not one word has been said about moral or religious instruction. We feel this to be a subject worthy of the greatest consideration. Convicts are placed in prisons to be punished and reclaimed, and not to earn money for the people. The revenue must be looked upon as a secondary matter. Money is as dust, compared to moral improvement. If, however, there are prisons where the productiveness of the labor is looked upon as the chief object, let it be so understood; though it were well to have it understood, at the same time, that it would not only be better, but cheaper for the State, annually to expend money, if, by so doing, the convicts could be reformed. The words of

John Howard should never be forgotten. "To reform prisoners, or to make them better as to their morals, should always be the *leading* view in every house of correction, and their earnings should only be a *secondary* object. As rational and immortal beings, we owe this to them, nor can any criminality of theirs justify our neglect in this particular."

Another subject of importance, connected with prisons, is punishment. The usual punishments under the Pennsylvania system are, being deprived of meals, put into a dark cell, and a straight jacket. There is also another mode, which is not a little remarkable; it is spoken of by Charles Robbins, Esq., and was told to him by an officer in the Pittsburg prison, and is inserted in the last Prison Discipline Report, p. 106. He says, they sometimes punish by putting the men "into a box, just large enough to hold one man; the box standing upon the end, and so fixed, that the inmate cannot lean one way or the other; while, to prevent kneeling down, there is a piece of hard wood or iron put through the box."

At the Sing-Sing prison they punish with whips. In the workshops, under the elevated seats where the keepers sit, may be seen these implements, which the keepers have power to use on the bare back, without reporting the case, and without a hearing for the prisoner. At the Auburn prison the officers use cowhides. They inflict puishments without consulting a higher officer, and report their doings about once a month. At the Charlestown prison no inferior officer can strike a convict, unless in self-defence. If a prisoner is careless, indolent, refractory, or even insolent, the turnkey or watchman can only report him to the warden, that he may punish him. At the South Boston prison, or house of correction, the most severe punishment is solitary confinement, without bed or blanket, with short allowance of food. Such are the principal modes of punishment; and it seems to us, that there is much that is wrong. The plan at Auburn and Sing-Sing is exceedingly bad, not only from the use of the whip, but from the freedom which is given to the under officers to use it at their own discretion. The whole method, we think, is calculated to do much harm. The plan at Charlestown is better; for the under officer can only report, while the prisoner has an opportunity to explain, and the punishment, if given, is inflicted by another. The plan at South Boston seems to us the best. There is something degrading and goading in the whip; something to

awaken feelings of hatred and revenge, to excite and exasperate the worst passions. There may be extreme cases where stripes are necessary, but we think every man, on reflection, must feel that the plan followed at Sing-Sing and some other prisons is a bad one, and cannot too soon be abolished. It has been stated that these prisons cannot be governed except in this way; and this is brought forward by Dr. Lieber, in his late pamphlet, as a strong argument against the whole system, and, if true, it would be against it. He says, —

"We do not blame the keepers of the Auburn penitentiaries for using the whip — they must do it. Let us hear nothing about the possibility of carrying on these prisons without flogging on the spot. The respective wardens must know it best, and they all insist upon the necessity. Ask them if they would dare to remain warden one hour after the right of flogging had been taken from them. It is from this very necessity of the whip, that we declare the system objectionable." — p. 88.

Now, while we censure the present use of the whip, we do not think, with Dr. Lieber, that it is a necessary part of the Auburn system. Indeed, we know it is not; for, at the South Boston prison, or house of correction, for four years, stripes have not been inflicted in a single instance. The superintendent says, —

"No corporeal punishment is, or ever has been, inflicted. Solitary confinement, without bed or blanket, with rations of bread and water, has never failed to produce the desired effect, even on the most refractory. For the less offences, the prisoner is punished by being deprived of certain meals, and kept at work, or by changing the situation, and placing him or her among those who are considered more degraded. The last has been found quite effectual with the junior part of the prisoners. By far a great majority of the punishments are among those committed for short periods. Those sentenced for years, it is seldom, with few exceptions, found necessary to punish or even reprimand." — p. 74.

It may be said that as much severity may be used in this way as in any other; and this is true. Solitary confinement in a narrow and dark cell, without bed or blanket, and with nothing for food but bread and water, if continued for any length of time, may be made even more galling than the sting of the lash. Still, if this method is used with humanity and

proper discrimination, is it not, in general, better calculated to lead the mind to reflection?

We would not be over-sensitive on the subject of punishments; we are aware that many of these men are abandoned and desperate, that some of them need very severe restrictions to keep them in order. But still we are persuaded that much evil is done by the present method of punishing. Men are roused to hatred and an almost fiendish revenge. The man is not appealed to, but the brute. Punishment should be just, rational, calm. It should lead the person punished to feel wherein he has done wrong. There is a chord even in the most corrupt heart, that vibrates to kindness, and a sense of justice, which knows when it has been rightly dealt with. The modes of punishment in some of our prisons cannot too soon be changed.

Another important subject to consider is the character of officers. If there is a place in the world where care should be had in the choice of officers, it is here. Every officer should be temperate, pure, honest, humane. He should not only be free from mean vices, but have a manly integrity, and, shall we not add, Christian devotion? We have been in prisons where all looked well to the eye, and pride was felt in displaying improvements, while the very officers, who talked of reforming others, were themselves profane. It should be understood, that, though a prison were upon the very best plan, and were, avowedly, governed by the best rules, bad officers would render it a den of abominations. No intemperate, or profane, or immoral man, should be suffered to hold any office within the walls of a prison. Those, who are keepers of their fellow-men, should live in the fear of God. There has, no doubt, been a very great reformation in regard to officers; but there is, still, much to be done. In selections and removals, party views and prejudices should be laid aside. There are individuals, of a right description, who can be obtained; individuals, who will enter upon their work as a religious duty, and who will labor with true missionary patience and zeal.

The office of chaplain is one of great importance. Every prison should have a chaplain. This has been greatly neglected. The duty of giving proper religious instruction has been little thought of. In many of our smaller prisons there is a sad deficiency in this particular. And the same may be said of some of the largest. In the Sing-Sing prison, the most exten-

sive in the country, where there are over eight hundred convicts, there is no resident chaplain. The person who officiates has the charge of a church in the village, and receives for his labors in the prison but five hundred dollars. Here are eight hundred men hardened in vice, guilty of crimes, which have subjected them to imprisonment, and the larger part of whom will soon be let loose again upon the community. Now these men require the constant ministrations of a most gifted mind; a man of great insight, true benevolence, sound judgment, sincere piety, and good common sense. In the last report from the inspectors of prisons, in the county of Suffolk, there are some valuable remarks on this subject.

"We wish to renew a suggestion," say they, "which we have formerly made to the mayor and aldermen, as to the expediency of employing a clergyman of respectability and experience as a resident chaplain, in a place where they have three large establishments, containing so many persons, and so immediately in the neighborhood of each other. The duties of a clergyman should exclude all other occupations, and employ all the powers of his mind, and be the constant and habitual employment of his time. His usefulness must depend almost entirely on this. One who is only in part devoted to the ministry, and in part to school keeping, or some other occupation, who has interfering thoughts and pursuits, and conflicting claims on his attention and interests, for some purposes is, practically, no minister at all. There are duties and occupations, on that spot of ground, more than enough for the whole time of any minister who ever lived. A particular kind of experience is necessary, and the appointment should be permanent. It would make a greater change in the habits and feelings of the place than anything else, and, if a proper person were obtained, it would prevent many from returning again, who will, otherwise, become the habitual inmates of prisons and houses of correction." — *City Document.* 1838. No. 21, p. 8.

But it is not enough simply to have a chaplain. There should be a person worthy of that office. We know not which is worst, a poor chaplain, or no chaplain at all. The duties of the office are arduous, and demand peculiar gifts. Too much care cannot be had, to engage the very best man that can be obtained. The penitentiaries of this country open a wide field for the philanthropist, and we see no reason why it is not as important a sphere of labor as that of foreign missions. Much has been done, but much more remains to be accomplished.

The office is, as yet, not duly appreciated. We trust that its true importance will soon be more deeply felt.

The next subject upon which we would speak is that of a Library and Sunday schools.

In many of the prisons, if not in all, each cell is supplied with a bible. In many of the prisons, also, tracts are occasionally distributed. But would it not be well, in addition to this, to have a permanent library of well selected religious books, which might be given out as a privilege to those whose conduct should have given satisfaction? We allude not to books of amusement, but to books of a moral and religious character, and which might make an impression upon the reader. There are times when the prisoner may read; and it seems a dismal thought that he should pass year after year, without this means of improvement. If books are useful to persons in society, how much more so must they be to those who are cut off from all communion with others. One would think it but reasonable, that, from the large sums of money which are now accumulating from the labor of the convicts, a small portion might be annually set apart for the purpose of collecting books of devotion and religious instruction. We wish that all inspectors of prisons would call the attention of legislators to this point, that appropriations for this object may be made. We would also suggest that books are needed, adapted to the wants of the convict. Appropriate publications, Companions for the Prisoner, Manuals and Guides to those who have committed Crime. If some good books of this nature were written, they might be exceedingly beneficial. In the mean time there are many books, both of biography and religious counsel, which might be read with profit, and which would make a good beginning for a Prison Library.

Sunday schools in prisons are another important means of reformation. In all the prisons where there have been Sunday schools, the chaplains and wardens bear testimony to their value. The teachers who are engaged in this work volunteer their services, and meet their classes on the Sabbath in the prison chapel. Few scenes can be more interesting than the sight of these men seated around their instructers, and listening anxiously, and at times with tears, to the words they utter. The classes are instructed by persons of different religious opinions, who teach the general principles of religion and morality. The prisoners consider it a privilege to attend, and

it is, without doubt, one of the most important means of leading them to reform. "It will at once be perceived," says the chaplain of the Massachusetts prison, "how much the institution is indebted to the disinterested and benevolent labors of those who engage in this business of imparting instruction to those committed to their care." The school at the Auburn prison also meets with great success, and the teachers labor with untiring zeal. We regret to learn, however, that, in some of our largest prisons, the school has been given up. The Report of the Sing-Sing prison says, "Those who engaged as teachers became less interested, as the novelty wore away; and classes of men were often brought out without any teacher appearing to instruct them." It would be of essential advantage, if the prisoners who attend the schools could always meet the same teachers; few persons, however, are willing to devote a portion of each Sabbath to this work, though in this way the good accomplished would be much greater.

Having been subjected to the discipline we have described, and having been surrounded by the influence of the officers of the prison, and the Sunday school teacher, the prisoner is finally to be released. The gates of the prison open, and the world is again before him.

The question then naturally presents itself, "What is done for the released convict?"

The answer is not so satisfactory as might be wished. They generally receive a suit of clothes, and from two to five dollars; this, with a word of advice, and they are turned upon society without employment, and without friends. The avenues of business are generally closed, and they are met with coldness and scorn. If wrong is committed, they are the first suspected; if laborers are wanted, they are the last employed. They seem to be stamped with infamy, and wherever they go the seal is known. The opposition they meet with is blasting to all their hopes. If they have ever so good resolutions at first, they are often crushed by the contempt with which they are surrounded. None meet them with sympathy except the abandoned, who seek again to entrap them and lead them to ruin.

This state of things is no doubt partly the result of the old prison discipline. In former times there was every reason to expect prisoners to come out worse than they went in. Thus the released prisoner was naturally looked upon with dread. By their imprisonment they were only confirmed in wickedness,

and it could not but follow that confidence should be taken away, and that the eye of man should rest upon them with constant suspicion. But now that wise means are put in action for the reformation of the offender, — now that the course of discipline is directed to the improvement of the mind, and conversion of the heart, to forming better habits, and implanting good principles, in as far as these means produce their object, ungenerous suspicions and prejudices should subside. Where prisoners give evidence of reformation, they should in some way be encouraged, and not driven back, as at the point of the bayonet, into their former vices.

Of course, no one expects that they can be received with entire confidence. This would be against the dictates of reason. They have done wrong, and have thus forfeited much; but in as far as they seem to be sincerely penitent, they should be met with Christian sympathy, aid, and counsel. If we could look back upon the past life of the prisoner, we should feel for him pity, rather than scorn. Perhaps in his very infancy he was placed in the midst of wickedness, and suffered to grow up without religious instruction; or perhaps he was decoyed in maturer years by the many temptations which are allowed to exist in society; or it may be, in a moment of passionate impulse, or thoughtless folly, he was precipitated at once into some criminal action. And shall such unhappy and misguided beings, when they become conscious of their sins, and pray for God's mercy, — when, with bitter anguish, they have wept over their miserable condition, and, with fear and trembling, wish to win their way into the paths of virtue, — shall they find every door, by which to return, closed, — every countenance averted?

"But," say some, "this shows the good sense of the community; this is the righteous indignation that follows wrong doing; this is that retributive justice which the wicked meet, even in this world." In answer to this, it may be said, that there is no justice in concentrating all our indignation upon the wrong doer who has been in prison, and forgetting the wrong doer who has not been. Are there not those in society, who are well received, who move in circles of wealth and fashion, yet who, in transactions of business, have been known to defraud? Are there not many without the walls of the prison, some of whose past doings might justly entitle them to a place within? And does the same indignation follow them? The

indignation which we should feel, should be against sin, — in high or low, rich or poor. If there is excuse anywhere, it is where there has been poverty and neglect. And when a man endeavors to overcome his sins, he should be put in a way of strengthening and establishing his character. Direct him to the right path; put him in the way of gaining an honest livelihood; and let him feel that he may, in the course of time, be looked upon with respect.

Individuals worthy of this assistance are yearly released from prison, and as the discipline improves, and more is done for moral and religious improvement, the number will no doubt increase. The chaplain of the Charlestown prison gives a detailed account of more than twenty who have been "confined and discharged since 1831," who have proved themselves worthy of confidence, many of them having been for years members of churches, and all having been temperate, industrious, and of good character; and this, in the face of those obstacles which often threatened to crush and overwhelm them.

The inspectors and chaplains of prisons have long felt the importance of doing something for such persons. The inspectors of the Massachusetts State prison say, —

"It is a subject deserving the most serious attention of the friends of humanity, to ascertain what can be done for the convict when he quits the penitentiary. Perhaps, at the present time, legislation cannot effect much; but the wise and good men, who have successfully labored to improve the places of confinement for the insane, for the poor debtor, and for the criminal, have here a field open for their exertions, in which, we believe, a harvest may be gathered, of praise to themselves and happiness for the wretched." — *Report for* 1835, pp. 4, 5.

Again, in the Report of 1837, they urge the importance of doing something, in still stronger language. The inspectors of the new penitentiary in Philadelphia, say, "the situation and sufferings of discharged convicts have excited our attention and sympathy, and we feel that we shall be excused in presenting the subject to the consideration of the legislature and our fellow citizens generally." The Annual Report of the inspectors of Sing-Sing says, in speaking of released convicts, "it would contribute much to their future reformation, if some systematical effort could be made, by the benevolent, to encourage them in

rectitude after their liberation. Many of them, on their discharge, are friendless and penniless, and, however disposed to return to honest industry, they know not to whom to go."

Dr. Tuckerman, in his valuable book "on the Ministry at Large," has some important remarks on the subject. In speaking of the newly discharged convict, he says, "Here is a call and a claim for sympathy, for which I should be most grateful to obtain attention. There are men capable of labor, and disposed to labor; but who is he, that, knowing that a man is a recently discharged convict, will trust him, and give him employment? I think that I have only once been able to obtain permament employment for such an one. I ask not," he adds, "for the discharged convict, however penitent he may seem, that he should be at once confided in, as if he had never swerved from uprightness. But I ask for sympathy with a fellow-being in the circumstances in which he would be, and is resolved to be, honest; but in which, unless so far aided as to be trusted, he cannot honestly obtain the means of subsistence. I ask for sympathy with him in the circumstances in which he must either be enabled to earn his bread by an honest employment, or starve, or steal." — pp. 317, 319.

Some little attention has been given to this subject abroad. Mr. Crawford, the secretary of the London Society, stated, when he was here, that there were two institutions in London, called Refuges for the Destitute; one for males, and the other for females, containing, together, two hundred and thirty inmates. They are for the reception and encouragement of those who are discharged from prison; and he stated that a very large proportion of all who had been thus received, employed for a time, encouraged, recommended, and assisted, had rewarded their benefactors with a life of usefulness.

Dr. Julius, the commissioner from the Prussian government to examine our prisons, stated, when here, that there was a gentleman of large landed property in Germany, living in a district which contains a population of two hundred thousand souls, who gave notice to the keepers of prisons within that district, that he would receive any discharged convicts, clothe, feed, lodge, and employ them, three or six months; and if, during that time, they proved themselves honest and faithful men, he would give them a written testimony of good character. This gentleman, Dr. Julius stated, had, in this way, saved great numbers from relapsing into crime.

Among us, almost nothing has, as yet, been done. It is desirable that a deeper and more extended interest should be felt by the community, on this subject. With regard to any plan, which has yet been proposed, there are difficulties. They are all open to some degree of objection; but shall we, because we have, as yet, found no perfect plan, rest satisfied with doing nothing?

We will speak of three ways by which these reformed individuals might be somewhat encouraged. First, by an institution where those, who should bring suitable certificates from the superintendent and chaplain, might be admitted and obtain work till they could find places elsewhere. Here they might have low wages, and comfortable abodes, and religious advisers. Some may say that this would be making too much of the convict, and thus tend to encourage crime; but we can hardly think a person would wish to go through two or three years' hard labor in the state prison, for the sake of having low wages till he could find regular employment. Some may say it would lead to hypocrisy; that the prisoners, before their time expired, would feign reformation; and, to some extent, it might be so; but we cannot think that, with good officers and chaplains, this would be carried far. By others, we have heard it objected, that such an institution would become a place of rendezvous, where convicts would collect, secretly mature plans, and then sally forth together. But it should be remembered that none would be admitted without satisfactory certificates, and that the doors would be open to those only who had given strong proof of reformation. Others, again, may say that the reformed prisoners themselves would not desire to go to such a place. To this objection those well acquainted with prisons reply, that prisoners, when released, often express a wish that there were some place where they might find shelter and work, until they could find means of gaining an honest livelihood. We have stated these objections, that they may be taken into consideration, and now pass to another suggestion.

While the legislature defer entering upon this work, much might be done, in a private way, by individuals. Each teacher in the Sunday school of the prison might be of great service to those under his care who should give evidence of reform. Before the time of the convicts' release he might obtain for them some place of employment; and, in this way, by continuing his exertions for prisoners after their time of imprisonment had

expired, and encouraging them in their efforts to regain a character, the teacher might infinitely increase his own usefulness, perform a work advantageous to the State, and grateful to humanity.

The warden and chaplain might often do much, if, when such a person was released, they would endeavor, beforehand, to find some occupation for him; or it might be part of the duty of some officer in the prison to make inquiries, and keep a list of those who would be willing, as an act of humanity, to employ such men from the prison as he might recommend.

Or the legislature might appoint an individual to investigate the whole subject, to correspond with others who have reflected on the matter, to visit prisons in various parts of the Union, and to take every possible measure to gather information, and mature some plan which would answer the desired purpose. Surely the object is worthy of this.

One thing very important is, to bring about a right state of public feeling, to awaken a proper interest in this unfortunate class of our fellow-creatures. We would have intelligent persons become personally acquainted with the officers of our prisons, with their modes of operation, with the general state of discipline. We would have those, particularly, who are interested in plans of moral improvement, especially ministers of the gospel, take a more active part in this work. Let the convict be able to say of them, "I was in prison, and ye came unto me." This might be the means of awakening such a state of public feeling, that the reformed convict, on his release, would meet with a just reception and proper encouragement.

In what we have said of prison discipline, we have endeavored to give a faithful sketch of what has been done, and to express our convictions concerning certain evils. Having spoken of Prisons, we would add a word on Jails. While the penitentiaries have been duly attended to, the county jails have been sadly neglected. Most of the buildings have been standing many years, and are on the old plan; so that, while there is separation and classification in our prisons, in our jails the wretched plan of indiscriminate intercourse is, to a great extent, continued. The inspectors of the penitentiaries in New Jersey, and Philadelphia, and Maryland, make loud complaints of the jails, and urge upon the legislatures of their several States to do something.

The physician of the Baltimore penitentiary says that the

jails of Maryland afford abundant opportunity for the exertions of a Howard. He states that the inmates are not provided with bed and bedding; that they lie on the bare floor; that they are not afforded a change of garments; and that the apartments are filled with filth and vermin.

We know that this is not a fair picture of all our jails, but that there is, very generally, throughout the country, a most urgent need of improvement, all, who are acquainted with the subject, must allow.

A late commissioner, sent from Europe to examine the prisons of this country, remarks, "There is far more injury resulting from confinement in the county jails of any State, than benefit from any penitentiary." For these things there is a remedy. New buildings should be erected. The new county jail at Hartford, and the house of correction at South Boston, seem to meet with general approbation. A jail on the same plan has been lately erected at Lowell.

We believe it would be productive of great good, if the legislature of each State would pass a law, making it the duty of every county to erect a jail on the new plan. And we should like to see inscribed over each of their doors, the words which Howard found in Rome, upon the walls of a noble edifice erected in 1704, by Pope Clement XI., "in which," says Howard, "the grand purpose of all civil policy relative to criminals is expressed: 'PARUM EST COERCERE IMPROBOS PŒNA, NISI PROBOS EFFICIAS DISCIPLINA.'" *It is of little advantage to restrain the bad by punishment, unless you render them good by discipline.*

R. C. W.

Art. V. — Religion an Essential and Indestructible Element of Human Nature.

God has made man a religious being. Religion is not a revelation from without, but an elementary principle of human nature. It is the province of revelation, not to create, but to enlighten, modify, and guide this principle, on which it, at the same time, depends for its evidence, its power, its success, its

ultimate universal ascendancy. These are the ideas which we now propose to establish, to vindicate from objection, and to exhibit as they unfold themselves in the religious history of our race.

We first remark that the religious principle is peculiar to man. The sentiment, which binds itself to a mysterious and invisible world, which manifests itself in the various forms of idolatry, superstition, and rational and dignified piety, no other animal exhibits, though there is scarcely any other sentiment or faculty inherent in man, which does not appertain, in some degree, to the inferior animals. They reason, plan, resolve, love, hope, and fear, with less acuteness and intenseness than the lords of the creation, but, so far as we can perceive, in an entirely similar manner. But they seem altogether insensible of the existence of a spiritual world; hold no communion with things invisible; love, fear, and honor, only things present and known.

Man, on the other hand, wherever found, is a religious being. The roving hunter, homeless though he be, yet has his God, to whom he dedicates a portion of his hard-won spoil, before he dares to eat the remainder. Warlike tribes, that delight in carnage, and know not the fear of man, lay down their arms, and quell their savage passions, before the altar. Even the oppressors of their race shudder in the presence of an invisible power, and grant to the fear of the gods, what could be drawn from them by no appeal to motives of justice or humanity. At the shrine of devotion, interest and anger, elsewhere omnipotent, are powerless and voiceless; vengeance is disarmed; hatred appeased. At the bidding of religion, the most imperious desires are immolated; suffering and death are fearlessly and joyously incurred. Every passion, every aspiration, has its devotional expression. The patriot prays and offers sacrifice for his country; the father, for his family. The petition of the prisoner pierces the walls of his dungeon, while the tyrant trembles on his throne, in the belief of an invisible power mightier than his own. Even the New-Hollanders, who have no idea of a future life, and who were, at first, triumphantly adduced by the French infidels as an exception to the universality of the religious principle, are now satisfactorily ascertained to be under its dominion. They worship the shades of departed men, and seek to propitiate them by magic arts. We may, then, (reserving, for further discussion, the apparent individual exceptions,) fairly consider the religious principle as universal.

But, is this principle bound up with the healthy energies of human nature; or, is it the offspring of ignorance, fear, weakness, or folly? It has been maintained, that ignorance is the mother of religion; that man, in the infancy of his nature, found himself surrounded by effects, which he could not trace to their causes, subjected to influences entirely beyond his control, and liable to alarms and perils, which he could neither foresee nor prevent, and that he resorted to the theory of invisible agency, in order to solve these manifold mysteries. But the obvious answer to this is, that religious feeling does not decrease with the increase of knowledge. Among the most earnest believers in the existence and attributes of Deity have been men, who have pushed human knowledge to its utmost verge, who have understood all mysteries, who have laid bare the springs of nature's mechanism, and sounded the depths of intellectual science. It could not have been ignorance which made such men as Bacon and Locke, Newton and Boyle, Hartley and Priestley, religious. Were ignorance the basis of religion, their names would have graced the meagre list of atheists. Nor can the religious principle owe its origin to fear; for there are animals, more timid than man, that yet manifest no sense of things unseen and spiritual. Moreover, among those, most deeply imbued with religious feeling, have been men of undoubted and preëminent heroism. The noblest triumphs of fortitude and courage have been won in the cause of religion, as in the case of martyrs in every age; and those nations, that have manifested the utmost degree of fearlessness and recklessness in war, have been among the most abjectly superstitious in matters pertaining to devotion. Nor can the religious sentiment in man be the result of his more exquisite physical organization; otherwise we should discern some traces of this sentiment in those animals, whose structure approaches the nearest to that of the human frame.

The religious principle, then, is peculiar to man; it may be traced in every condition of society, and among all classes of men; nor can it be accounted for by man's physical organization, or his incidental imperfections and infirmities. We thence infer that it is an innate, essential, and indestructible element of man's spiritual nature.

But here we are met by a plausible objection. It is said, "There are atheists, many atheists, in the world, men entirely destitute of religious principle and feeling, which, surely, could

not be the case, were man, by nature, a religious being." So there are idiots in the world; but, does their existence prove, that man is not, by nature, a reasonable being? Every department of creation has its exceptions and anomalies; nor does their occasional occurrence make void general rules or principles. But the case of the atheist does not correspond to that of the idiot. Who ever heard of a person's being born an atheist? Who ever heard of an atheist infant or child? The very men, who are now atheists, whether religiously educated or not, in early life were under the dominion of the religious principle, believed the existence of a spiritual world, stood in dread of unseen powers; and, so far are they from asserting, that the godless atmosphere which they now breathe is their native air, that they boast of having escaped an hereditary thraldom, of having broken the chains with which their infant limbs were fettered. Their case, then, corresponds not to that of the idiot from birth, but to that of him, whom accident or disease has deprived of reason. They were, by nature, endowed with the religious principle; but a moral pestilence has breathed upon their souls, and blighted this choicest plant of God's husbandry, — yet not blighted it hopelessly or eternally, for it is indestructible, and has gathered, from solitary, suffering, expiring atheism, some of the proudest trophies of its strength and permanence.

There have been very few consistent unbelievers. There have been many who could talk and write bravely against religion, who, in solitude or at the approach of death, have been haunted by terrific visions from the unseen world, and have atoned, by hours of agonizing belief, for their moments of boastful infidelity. Rousseau, though he assayed, all his life long, to reason himself and others out of all religious faith, never could entirely rid himself of the impressions of his childhood. When alone, and heart-stricken, he always felt the need of religious sentiments and principles; and his writings are full of involuntary tributes, often of thrilling eloquence, to the worth and power of spiritual truth. Byron furnishes a similar instance. He has often, and with justice, been stigmatized as an atheist. He was so, in theory; and many are the passages scattered through his works, in which he opens, before his awe-chilled reader, the rayless, hopeless, unfathomable gulf of infidelity. Yet, godless as was his creed, profligate as was his life, he could not entirely stifle his religious convictions;

and the smothered torch-light of faith ever and anon breaks forth with almost supernatural lustre, and often gives a holy brilliancy to one side of the leaf, the other side of which is black as midnight. Who can read such lines as the following, and not confess that, when he penned them, he felt, in his inmost soul, that unseen and all-pervading power, which he so often scorned and blasphemed?

> "How often we forget all time, when lone,
> Admiring Nature's universal throne,
> Her woods, her wilds, her waters, the intense
> Reply of *hers* to our intelligence!
> Live not the stars and mountains? Are the waves
> Without a spirit? Are the dropping caves
> Without a feeling in their silent tears?
> No, no; they woo and clasp us to their spheres,
> Dissolve this clod and clog of clay before
> Its hour, and merge our soul in the great shore,
> Strip off this fond and false identity!
> Who thinks of self, when gazing on the sky?" *

Numerous, also, have been the instances, in which bereavement, or some other form of sorrow, has led the professed unbeliever back to the creed of his early years. In Europe, many, who were acknowledged free-thinkers in the morning of life, have closed their days as devotees in convents. Within the circle of our own acquaintance is an eloquent defender and preacher of Christianity, who was once an atheist, and who, as such, attended the obsequies of a very dear friend. The moment that the coffin was let down into the grave was to him a moment of intense feeling. The first suggestion of his gloomy creed was that the being of his friend was utterly extinct. But the very next instant, faith in a life unseen and immortal burst upon his mind with irresistible power; he went from the grave a believer in truths, against which he was armed with all the panoply of sophistry, but which now sprang up spontaneously in the inmost recesses of his soul, from the divinely implanted principle of religion, and started at once into too vigorous a growth to be again uprooted.

But some, yea, many, have maintained their atheistical principles through numerous vicissitudes of life. Comparatively few, however, have died atheists; and most of those, who have so died, have hardly died a rational death, having either gone

* The Island, Canto II.

out of the world in brutal insensibility, or, like the celebrated Hume, dispelled the thoughts of death by frivolous amusements. Several of the principal English infidels were unwilling to live out of the pale of the church, and anxiously solicitous to enjoy the benefit of its ritual at the hour of death. Many of the champions of infidelity have breathed their last with the most fearful apprehensions, with deep remorse, with agonizing despair. The death-scene of Altamont, as described by Dr. Young, horrid as it is, is no more than a fair specimen of recorded death-scenes of infidels, numerous enough to fill a volume. Even that arch-apostle of unbelief, Voltaire, seems to have suspected, towards the close of life, that he had been wrestling against the truth, and, in his last sickness, kept himself constantly surrounded by priests, and clung, with childlike superstition, to the outward forms of religion.*

Now, in contrast with these several classes of instances, we can find no cases of the contrary kind, — no cases, in which religious men have, in seasons of solitude or gloom, in bereavement, sickness, or death, sought refuge in infidelity. Is it not, then, an irresistible inference from these premises, that religion is congenial to man's nature, while infidelity is not so; that religion is an indestructible principle of the soul, infidelity a short-lived hallucination of the brain?

But we would not confine ourselves to individual instances. We would invite our readers to a rapid survey of the history of modern infidelity, and hope to gather from it unimpeachable testimonials to the rank which we have assigned to the religious principle as an innate and indestructible element of human nature. The most adroit and arduous efforts have often been made to seduce portions of our race from their religious faith; but the result has always been, that, if bewildered and misguided for a time, they have returned to a belief in the invisible world, and clung to it with tenfold their former ardor. In England, among those who have denied Christianity, there have been very few professed atheists; and so strong has been the inward feeling, which has bound the people to religion, that those, who have denied the divinity of the Gospel, have commonly assumed the attitude of restorers and defenders of natural religion. Even the profligate Thomas Paine assumes,

* This view of Voltaire's last hours, we are aware, has been often contradicted; we have never seen it refuted.

throughout his works, a show of devotion to the God of Nature, and zeal for his honor; for he well knew that, without such a show, his impurity and impiety would be received with universal loathing.

In France, the temporary reign of infidelity was prepared for by gross corruption on the part of the guardians of religion. The clergy, though intolerant in their official acts, had been, for many years, careless of their doctrines, dissolute in their lives; and had moulded the dominant mode of faith and worship into a form at once frivolous and repulsive, fair game alike for the sneers of the profane and the indignation of the ingenuous. The dignitaries of the church were writing obscene romances, and luxuriating in unrestrained self-indulgence, all the while that they were proscribing Rousseau, and issuing their wrathful fulminations against Voltaire. The nation saw, and knew, and felt these things, and were thus prepared to cast away their religious convictions. The revolution came; and, if its history prove not the religious principle an essential element of human nature, then is all history voiceless. For, are we willing to recognise, as appertaining to human nature, that bloodthirsty rage, which armed each godless wretch against neighbors and kindred, against helpless infancy and weaponless age, which glutted the guillotine with victims, and hung every lantern-post in Paris with the bodies of the murdered? If this were human nature, far be it from us to claim for it any noble or godlike attribute. But this conduct was confessedly unnatural; it indicated a national insanity,—an insanity for which there was no other apparent cause than the tearing away of all religious belief. Now, may not that, the removal of which subverts nature, and produces an insanity so dire, be fairly deemed essential to human nature?

The results of the revolution bear equally explicit testimony to the view which we have taken of the religious principle. A vigorous tree, which has its upward growth checked by some intervening obstacle, shoots out laterally in strange contortions, and shows, by its labyrinthal progress, the depth of its root, and the richness of its juices. Just so the religious principle in France, deprived of the traditional supports to which it clung, and thus prevented from developing itself in its wonted direction, was for a while suppressed, but only to seek out, with unprecedented energy, new modes of development, and a wider range of objects. France is now compensating for her

age of unbelief, by an age of reverence and credulity. The history of religion is sought out with the most intense interest. Every monument of every religion is held sacred. Every religious act of past or present times, whether the prompting of enlightened faith, or of blind bigotry, is lauded. Every form and manifestation of the religious principle is respected, nay, deified. Even in the lightest branches of literature, in the romance and the drama, inspiration is sought from the throne of the Almighty, and the boundless future. There seems to be a striving, convulsive, indeed, and often aimless, yet sincere and intense, to reëstablish the communication with heaven and eternity. There is manifested throughout the whole nation a mysterious agitation, a desire to believe, a thirst for objects of faith.

Germany, too, bears noble testimony to the claim of the religious principle to be regarded as an innate and indestructible element of human nature. There has been in that country a most eccentric union of skepticism and credulity, of contempt for antiquated forms, and a firm attachment to religion itself, as distinct from its forms. The Rationalism of Germany has been stigmatized as infidelity. Most earnestly should we deprecate its transportation to our shores, lest, in our less congenial soil, it should degenerate into infidelity. But, with many of the German theologians, rationalism flows from the purest and loftiest spiritualism. They deny a *peculiarly* supernatural character to the works of Jesus and his apostles, not because they would limit the Divine omnipotence; but they see no ground for the division of events into natural and supernatural; they discern no meaning in such terms as Nature and the Laws of Nature; and maintain that everything that takes place is a miracle. They deny, also, the *peculiarly* divine mission of Jesus; not for lack of respect for his teachings, and reverence for his character; but because they regard every human being as a divine messenger, sent to earth by God, for some express purpose, and furnished and prompted by the Divine Spirit to the work for which he is sent. And to the great moral truths of the Gospel these mystifiers of the sacred word profess and manifest an ardent attachment. Thus, though they have rejected the arguments on which the belief of the multitude rests, the religious principle within maintains unshaken an apparently baseless fabric of faith. Atheism hardly exists in Germany. There is, indeed, prevalent, a view of the Divine nature, which

some are wont to brand, though improperly, as atheism. We mean *Pantheism;* a system, which identifies God with his works; which supposes every atom that exists not only to be pervaded by his presence, but to be a manifestation of Himself; which, in fine, blends God and nature, in the vast conception of an infinite, all-pervading, all-embracing, everywhere-working Intelligence. Such are the forms which the religious principle has assumed in Germany, where, had it been destructible, bigotry and tyranny would have long since destroyed it; where it has been left to struggle into ever new and nobler life, by its own insurmountable elasticity, and unconquerable energy.

In this country infidelity has, for many years, been disseminating its poison, but, until very recently, under the specious name of deism; and to that disguise it has owed most of its converts. Wherever it has assumed the genuine garb of sheer, blank atheism, it has stemmed but for a short period the torrent of public feeling. Owen attempted, in vain, to establish his republic of atheists, and returned to his native country, baffled and disappointed. The female Quixote in the cause of infidelity has, indeed, made many converts, but chiefly among those in whom profligacy and sensuality had already obliterated every finer feeling and more generous sentiment of their natures. An aged apostate and blasphemer has recently run a successful race in this city; but his career was brief. Many, who approved and admired, while he professed to vindicate the God of Nature from the aspersions of priestcraft, have been disgusted since he assumed atheistical ground; have found too strong a testimony within against the fool who saith "There is no God."

Time would fail us to trace the history of infidelity any farther. Suffice it to say, that atheism, in every age and land where it has appeared, has had an exceedingly brief reign, which has always been followed by a violent reaction, by a convulsive clinging to religious faith in all its forms, however wild or absurd. On the other hand, no form of religious belief has ever been found too irrational or unnatural to obtain disciples, to take deep root, and gain a permanent influence. Facts like these prove, incontestibly, that man is, by nature, a religious being; that a craving for objects of religious belief and worship is a no less essential element of his spiritual nature, than is the appetite for food, of his animal constitution; and that the spiritual, like the physical craving, is so intense as to glut itself on uncongenial and unwholesome nutriment, rather than to remain unnourished.

But it may be asked, Of what avail is this religious principle, if it be liable to be palpably misguided, and grossly abused, — if it serve as a basis for all the wild and dark forms of superstition, fanaticism, and bigotry? We answer, that every propensity and faculty of our nature may be equally misguided and abused. This is the case with our animal instincts, with reason, with benevolence, with all those attributes that constitute the glory of our intellectual and moral natures. Every endowment that we have from God needs to be instructed, quickened, and guided by Himself, in order to be truly and permanently valuable; and He has established a system of means, by which all our endowments are ultimately to be educated, sanctified, and brought into entire accordance with His will. The religious principle, we confess, has often had absurdity and folly engrafted upon it; but it was designed to be, is daily becoming more and more generally, and will, at last, be universally, a medium of pure light and unadulterated truth.

The religious principle, as modified by education, might be compared to the idea of extended space, which, if it cannot be strictly termed an innate idea, results so necessarily from our position in space as to be coëval with our earliest mental operations. We all spontaneously conceive of an immeasurable extent beyond and above the field of our vision. But this unseen space men people variously, according to their knowledge or their ignorance. With some, it is a region of absurd fable, — a fairy land. Others form opinions strangely wide of the truth, concerning the soil, climate, and inhabitants of distant countries, and the nature of the heavenly bodies. Others, again, have been enlightened by the sciences of geography and astronomy; and, consequently, form right ideas of the space that lies beyond and above them. In like manner, the religious principle gives us a sense of a power above, and a sphere beyond our own, of higher and purer existences, of infinity and eternity; and fastens in our minds a strong conviction of the reality of a spiritual world. But it does not furnish us the statistics of that world; it leaves us to people it according to our respective tastes, and our several degrees of knowledge. With some, it is a land of shadows; with others, full of the chimeras of a fantastic imagination; — with some, cantoned out among "gods many, and lords many;" with others, under the government of a single potentate; — with some, a scene of ease; with others, of activity; — with some, a sensual, with others, an in-

tellectual paradise. All are fully conscious of the existence of this unseen world; but none can venture to pronounce with certainty anything with regard to it, unless on the authority of some one who has explored and revealed it. Many false accounts are published concerning it, by those who pretend to have witnessed or heard its mysteries, just as spurious narratives of voyages and travels have been written concerning every unknown region of the globe. But, like the visible heavens and earth, the unseen spirit-land has its authentic and accurate geography and astronomy. These are furnished us in the Bible; and those, who thence derive their notions of truth, have the religious principle within them fully informed and infallibly guided.

The revelation of the spiritual world was not, however, made at once to mankind, but was gradually unfolded from age to age, as has been the case with every department of human science. God first made himself known to the fathers of our race as the supreme luminary of that unseen heaven of which they were conscious, as the sole object of that worship which the voice within prompted them to pay. And, from time to time, He sent a messenger from his invisible presence, to talk with the patriarch at the door of his tent, to warn him of danger, and to guide him in safety. But, as yet, there was no definite process of instruction; only shadowy glimpses of things unseen were vouchsafed. Under Moses a regular system of tuition commenced. The Jews, however, were not sufficiently capable of abstract thought to contemplate spiritual truth, except through material images. God, therefore, selected those objects of nature and art which seemed best fitted for the purpose, traced upon them the pictures of things invisible and eternal, and gave them to the Jews in the Mosaic ritual; and this on the same principle, on which the judicious father, before his child is old enough to use a book, teaches him letters by writing them on his toys. With Jesus of Nazareth a clearer dispensation dawned. It was no longer necessary to instruct man by pictures and enigmas. We, therefore, have, in the Gospel, literal, distinct, and sufficiently ample views of the world above and beyond us.

We might divide the manifestations of the religious principle among men into two classes; namely, those in which it has developed itself, and those in which God has clothed it. The former are noble, vast, and worthy of regard and reverence;

the latter are transcendently pure and lovely, — are "perfect, even as God is perfect." The former leave numerous doubts unsettled, numerous questions unanswered; the latter answer every candid inquiry, settle every reasonable doubt. Wherever the latter have been made known, the religious principle has adopted them, as best satisfying its cravings. This was the case with Judaism, which, though it imposed a heavy burden, yet had its proselytes from every nation under heaven. And the reason why Christianity, unseconded by an arm of flesh, has made and is making rapid progress all the world over, is that it is congenial, satisfactory. It is a religion inspired by the Author of the human soul, and must, therefore, be suited to its necessities and desires.

On this ground would we base our confidence in the permanence and final supremacy of Christianity. Did it not have its foundation in human nature, when we see discord within the Christian camp, and hear the shout of anticipated triumph from foes without, we should fear that the word of prophecy was unsure, that the era of Zion's glory had passed, that the star of Solyma was already on the wane, and soon to be quenched in night. But no. The Gospel and man are made for each other; and must, therefore, together pass down the current of time, and together be merged in the ocean of eternity; —

> "And this tempestuous state of human things
> Is merely as the working of a sea
> Before a calm, that rocks itself to rest."

A. P. P.

ART. VI. — 1. *The Life of Cardinal Cheverus, Archbishop of Bordeaux, and formerly Bishop of Boston, in Massachusetts. From the French of J. Huen-Dubourg, Priest, and late Professor of Theology.* Boston: James Munroe and Company. 1839. 12mo. pp. 372 and xxiv.

2. *Life of the Cardinal de Cheverus, Archbishop of Bordeaux. By the Rev. J. Huen Doubourg, Ex-Professor of Theology.* Translated from the French by Robert M. Walsh. Philadelphia: Hooker and Claxton. 1839. 12mo. pp. 280.

THIS work is both curious and valuable as a specimen of Popish credulity and French exaggeration. In the absence of

anything better it is also valuable as the life of Cardinal Cheverus. He must be a novice indeed who is led astray by its erroneous statements. The character of Cheverus, so chaste, simple, unassuming, true, stands out distinct from all the flummery that is thrown round it. We took up the work with no knowledge of its subject beyond what every one must have; and, in spite of its tinsel and false coloring, it has given to us a picture of simplicity, self-sacrifice, humility, and Christian love, such as it has seldom been our privilege to receive. No one can be deceived by its misstatements. They are like the plaster and blankets with which some clumsy artist might hope to improve the appearance of an ancient statue. They may offend and provoke us; but we cannot mistake them for a part of the original work, of which the minutest details have an individuality and finish that cannot be counterfeited.

In the present instance we do not think it worth our while to burthen our columns with an exposure of errors. They bear about with them their own condemnation. Who does not see, at once, that a great portion of what relates to the Indians is entirely Frenchified, and no more a part of authentic history than the story of Paul and Virginia? So with respect to the scene described (p. 103), where it is said, that a whole audience were so moved by the eloquence of the bishop, that, when he took the crucifix, "the Protestants, forgetting their sharp controversy, kissed the cross of the Savior, with tears and affection." All this might have been done by one or two Protestants of a peculiarly sympathetic temperament, at the Catholic church; but no one would think of attributing it to a whole congregation. Of the same character are most of the general eulogiums. The extravagance of the language takes away our confidence. The fault of the author is one which he has in common with most of the travellers who have been among us. A single fact, remarkable for its singularity, is made the basis of a general assertion. All that we have to do is, by a well known rule of mathematics, to reduce the general assertion to its original dimensions. Who is deceived by the apparent greatness of a bladder; or by swollen accounts like this? * "He

* Not to attribute too large a share of blame to the author of this "Life," it should be observed that many of the most questionable statements contained in his book appear to have been derived from materials furnished him from Boston. For instance, the statement quoted above

was (in Boston) the confidant and counsellor of all; and one of the lessons most frequently impressed upon their children by mothers, was, in all the troubles and difficulties of life, to go to M. Cheverus, ask his advice, and follow it"!

We have no fear that men will be misled by these and similar exaggerations. That, which has given us most pain, is, that a life of such various and solid merit should have been prepared in that loose and eulogistic style, which always lessens the weight of a writer's opinions, and detracts so much from the authority of his statements. Mere actors upon the stage may be tricked out with this factitious glory; but the names of those, who by their purity and truth have given dignity to man, should be recorded in characters as plain, true, chaste, and substantial, as themselves. We need not say, therefore, how much we have been disappointed in the work before us. We see and feel its defects. But the author has brought to our notice a really good man, of whom we before knew little more than the name; and, however pompously he may have done it, we cannot find it in our hearts to be very severe on one who has introduced us to so pleasant and instructive an acquaintance. We conscientiously commend the book to others. We regret that it is not more worthy of its subject; but, in the absence of a better, we believe that even this may do good. Of the two translations that have just appeared, the Boston is decidedly the best; being more literally exact, and purer English.

---

is derived from a "Memoir of Bishop Cheverus," published in the *Boston Monthly Magazine*, edited by the late Samuel L. Knapp, Esq., for June, 1825. "Bishop Cheverus," says the writer of this "Memoir," "numbered among his most intimate friends a large circle of intellectual females of the Protestant faith, and many of them moving in the higher walks of life. In his judgment and friendship they reposed implicit confidence; and not only consulted him themselves, but taught their children, in every painful or delicate exigency of their lives, to call on him for counsel and direction. They knew his bosom would be a safe repository of their secrets and their griefs, and that his wisdom would suggest the most honorable course of duty. In truth it may be said, that he had as many confidential communications out of the confessional as in it."—See the *Translator's Preface* to the Boston edition of the work which is the subject of the present article. It should be added, in justice to M. Huen-Dubourg, (who is said to be an ecclesiastic of elevated character,) that, improbable as many of his statements appear, his Boston translator has shown, with respect to some of them, certainly, that there is no reason to believe them to be mere fabrications of his own imagination.

It should be added, that it is a translation of the entire work; while Mr. Walsh's is much abridged. The life of Cheverus *ought* to be among the most valuable religious biographies of the age. In these times of philosophical refinement, when the good old spiritual truths, that the apostles and their followers had believed for centuries, must be *etherealized*, in order to escape the appearance of vulgarity, it is delightful to fall in with a man, who is content to serve his Maker by a life of usefulness and prayer, and then go down to his grave in the hopes of a religious faith. The piety and philosophy of the day are becoming squeamish and diseased. There is a want of straight-forward, progressive energy. Instead of bringing out their faculties by robust and active virtue, and cherishing their sensibilities by the healthy exercise for which they were given, our young people are puling over their natures with a sickly fondness. The buds of spring are overshadowed by the skies of autumn. The expanding impulses of youth are pinched and frozen by those chilling habits of reflection, which are as unnatural and debilitating to them, as they are graceful and strengthening to the mature man. Children, whose business it is to grow, must have a theory of human life. The duties of home, offices of common sympathy and politeness, must be neglected, the exercises of private, spontaneous prayer passed by, and the poor left shivering at the door, until our young philosophers can make up their minds as to the course which will most effectually secure their own improvement.

Nothing could be a more effectual antidote to all this than the life of a man like Cheverus; and it is a matter of regret that such a life we do not possess. But the work before us does something. It is written in the most perfect good faith. The author has no doubt that every word is true. His credulity reminds us of the golden times of papal authority. And in our age of skeptical rashness even this is *rather* refreshing. He does not darkly pry into the secret fountains of thought. His work is shallow; but it makes no pretensions to philosophy; and we are rejoiced for once to be allowed to draw inferences for ourselves. If it afford but little direct insight into the human soul, the lesson indirectly taught is beyond price. After all the deductions that we are obliged to make — and they are very great — it does hold up to us one whose thoughts and sensibilities, finding always a ready vent in action, made him at once a thoroughly happy and a thoroughly good man. No

specific directions are given, by which the soul, in its struggles with sin and doubt, may be calmed; nor is the author competent to give them; but he brings before us a life of active piety and beneficence, more efficacious, we believe, than all the philosophical prescriptions of the day.

We wish to give a slight sketch of the life of Cheverus. For many of the facts we shall state, we have no authority but the work of Dubourg. We shall confine ourselves, however, to such statements as harmonize with what we know from other sources of the cardinal's character. If in any instance the letter should prove false, we feel assured that the general impression it may give is true.

John, Cardinal de Cheverus, was born at Mayenne in France, Jan. 28, 1768. He was ordained a priest in 1790; banished from France in 1793; remained three years in England, which he left for America in 1796. He was made Bishop of Boston in 1808, and returned to France in 1823, where he was consecrated Bishop of Montauban. In 1826 he was made Archbishop of Bordeaux, and, soon after, a Peer of France. In the spring of 1836 he was raised to the dignity of Cardinal, and died July 19th of the same year.

Born of an honorable family, educated in childhood by a mother worthy of such a son, at the age of twelve he dedicated himself to the service of God, and already began his work of devotion, charity, and virtue. At school he was among all his companions the most light-hearted in his sports, the most diligent in his studies. As a child the only punishment he feared was, that he might be thought unworthy to join with his parents in their evening worship. At the age of thirteen he was thrown into a college, where teachers and pupils were alike infected by the loose morals and general contempt for religion, which marked that disastrous period in France; yet there his fasts, his prayers, and weekly communion, were rigidly observed. And with all this severity towards himself, such were his kindness and gentleness towards others, such his vivacity and talents, his purity and sincerity, that among scoffers and infidels, young men of profligate sentiments and lives, he not only commanded universal respect, but seems to have been the favorite of all.

A generous spirit of self-sacrifice was perhaps the leading feature of his life. At the age of thirteen, against the advice of his attorney, he put an end to a law-suit by giving up all his

claims, just at the time when it was about to be decided in his favor; because he feared, that, in gaining the suit, he should ruin the adverse party. He came to England, an inexperienced young man, ignorant alike of the people and the language, with less than sixty dollars for his whole resources. The English government proffered assistance. He gratefully declined their aid, saying, that the little he had would answer till he might get some knowledge of the language, and then he could support himself, though it should be only by working with his own hands. In a few months, by his industry in teaching, he was able not only to provide for himself, but to contribute something also to the support of his unfortunate countrymen. Before leaving England, by a legal instrument he renounced all claim on his paternal estate, and set out on his mission to America, feeling himself freed from every weight that might bind him to the world, and prepared to engage in that cause, which had first been spread through the world by the labors of twelve poor fishermen. When about to depart from America he again gave up all his property, even his library, and left Boston with nothing but the same trunk that he had brought with him twenty-eight years before.

Whether his income were large or small, his own mode of living was the same. At Boston he had but one small room. The chairs were of the most ordinary kind; often there were not enough of these to accommodate his visitors; and then his bed, which consisted only of some boards, raised a little above the floor and covered with a thin mattress, was used to supply the deficiency. While bishop of Boston he split his own fire-wood and, while Archbishop of Bordeaux, not unfrequently brought it in with his own arms. "This," he said, "is the only way of being waited upon to one's taste," and then it left such resources for the poor.

The generosity of Cheverus was not only connected with rigid economy, but pervaded by a nice sense of justice. While glad to spend all his income, he was never willing to exceed it, however pressing the call might seem. He did not feel at liberty to trust to Whitfield's "bank of faith" for the payment of his debts. In building the Catholic church in Boston, when the funds were exhausted, he stopped the work, and forbade a single stone to be laid, until new resources were obtained. Offers of credit were made, but not accepted. "The funds," he replied, "depend on the generosity of others, and as I can-

not be answerable for them, I will not expose any one to loss."

He felt that to be a very suspicious generosity, which consists merely in the giving of alms. In preaching once upon this subject, he took for his text the raising of the dead child by the prophet Elisha. At first the prophet sent a servant to lay his staff upon the child; but all to no purpose. It was not till he went himself, took the child in his arms, and breathed into it his own breath, that the limbs were warmed. So in our charities. "As the dew," he sometimes said, "refreshes the earth which has been parched by the burning sun, so a kind word is worth more than a gift to the soul withered and dried up by misfortune." Such was the almost womanly tenderness of his nature, that wherever trouble and sorrow were, whether among rich or poor, there was always enough to engage his sympathy. He did not muse in solitude on human misery, but was everywhere employed amid poverty and distress. During the yellow fever in Boston, amid the general consternation caused by a new and fatal disease, the poor were often deserted by their kindred, and left alone without assistance and without hope. To these wretched beings Cheverus hastened, calmed their imaginations, which were often more diseased than their bodies, raised and turned them in their beds, and performed for them services, the most disgusting and humiliating, were it not that charity ennobles whatever it inspires. In vain did his friends represent, that he ought not thus to expose himself. "It is not necessary," he replied, "that I should live, but it is necessary that the sick should be taken care of, the dying assisted." While others were flying from the pestilence, he stood (though *not* "alone," as his French biographer declares,) among the dead and the dying with a calmness which seemed to suspect no danger, and a humility which was hardly conscious of a sacrifice in that which was admired as an act of lofty self-devotion.

At Montauban an unusual inundation was sweeping away many habitations of the poorest citizens. He rushed to the spot, ordered boats to their assistance, and himself directed the works till all were secured. He then threw open his palace, and received into it three hundred houseless beings. Only one poor woman was left out; who feared to come in because she was a protestant. The good bishop ran to her and with the words, "we are all brethren here, especially in misfortune," placed her among the rest.

But his charity was not confined to great occasions. You might find him in some wretched hovel in Broadstreet, with a child in his arms, administering the last consolations of religion, watching over the sick child and dying father, till the wife or mother, refreshed by sleep, is able to resume her place. On a cold and stormy day he has been met several miles from the city, going on foot through mud and rain to cheer the last hour of some poor man.

We must remember that these disagreeable duties were performed by one of a sensibility so delicate and shrinking, that only with extreme pain could he ever think of the wretched beings, who are suffering upon the earth, whom disease and want, revolutions and civil wars overwhelm with their sorrows.

His delicacy of feeling was, perhaps, nowhere more severely tried than among the Indians in Maine, whom he visited every year. When he first went among them, he was invited to share their repast. Should he refuse, it might give them pain, and yet everything was nauseously filthy and disgusting. He overcame his scruples, swallowed the broth they had prepared, and ate of the meat they presented on the bark of a tree. Then, with a tone of great kindness, he told them that, in future, bread would be all the food that he should require.

Cheverus remained among us till 1823, when the king of France recalled him in order to install him over the bishopric of Montauban. The ties which bound him here were too strong to be broken. At first he refused to go. But the French government persisting in its request, and his physicians representing that he could not, without great hazard, continue here through another winter, he felt no longer at liberty to remain. Protestants and Catholics almost alike regretted their loss. "We hold him," says a paper signed by two hundred of the first citizens of Boston, "to be a blessing and a treasure to our social community, which we cannot part with, and which, without injustice to any man, we may affirm, if withdrawn from us, can never be replaced." Even the jailer, we are told, came, deeply moved, to take leave of him. The bishop, with his usual mildness, said to him, "Those that leave you generally are delighted to get out of your way; it is not so with me; I leave you with pain, and shall always remember your kindness towards the poor prisoners."

The evening before he left Boston his friends crowded

around him, threw themselves upon him, wept over him. And where private feelings had no influence, his departure was lamented as a public loss. Where shall we find a more touching and beautiful eulogium than the following, which first appeared in our journal, and which, though long familiar, we cannot even now read without a quickening of the pulse?

"Has not," says Dr. Channing, in his article on Fenelon, "the metropolis of New England witnessed a sublime example of Christian virtue in a Catholic bishop? Who, among our religious teachers, would solicit a comparison between himself and the devoted Cheverus? This good man, whose virtues and talents have now raised him to high dignities in church and state, who now wears in his own country the joint honors of an archbishop and a peer, lived in the midst of us, devoting his days and nights, and his whole heart, to the service of a poor and uneducated congregation. We saw him declining, in a great degree, the society of the cultivated and refined, that he might be the friend of the ignorant and friendless; leaving the circles of a polished life, which he would have graced, for the meanest hovels; bearing, with a father's sympathy, the burdens and sorrows of his large spiritual family; charging himself alike with their temporal and spiritual concerns; and never discovering, by the faintest indication, that he felt his fine mind degraded by his seemingly humble office. This good man, bent on his errands of mercy, was seen in our streets under the most burning sun of summer, and the fiercest storms of winter, as if armed against the elements by the power of his charity. He has left us, but not to be forgotten. He enjoys among us what, to such a man, must be dearer than fame. His name is cherished where the great of this world are unknown. It is pronounced with blessings, with greatful tears, with sighs for his return, in many an abode of sorrow and want."

The perfect simplicity of his character, united as it was with feelings so warm and sensitive, is, perhaps, what strikes us most in the life of Cheverus. This was the true secret of his strength. It gave consistency to all his efforts. It directed to a single point those powerful impulses, which, for want of unity, are so often thrown away upon a great variety of subjects. None of the gifts which God had bestowed on him were ever lost. The passions of youth, instead of laying waste what the vigor of manhood must be exhausted in repairing, were already building up the character of the man. From this unity

of purpose we find in him a completeness, through which every part of his life gives strength to the whole. We feel that it is always the same man who is before us. In the cellars of Broadstreet, and in the palace of Charles the Tenth, or Louis Philippe; in the schoolboy and the peer of France; in the young abbé and the old archbishop, we find always the same humble, healthy, devoted minister of the cross. His official conduct was not something assumed; it was a part of himself. Through the forms of time he looked ever to those great spiritual interests which are supreme and eternal. After giving a very simple discourse on the plainest precepts of Christian duty, he was told that many of the nobility were present. "I knew nothing of that," he replied, "and if I had, the entertainment would have been the same." Being called to preach before an assembly of conceited and tumultuous students, his discourse was almost worthy of the apostle from whom his text was taken. "I am determined," he began, "to know nothing among you, but Jesus Christ, and him crucified. If it were my business to speak of human sciences, it would be in this learned school, and from you, gentlemen, that I should seek instruction; but now I am to speak of the science of the cross, a science which I have been studying and preaching these forty years among civilized nations and savage tribes," * * *. And such were the simplicity, sincerity, and dignity of his manner, that all listened in silence, with strong interest and attention. We have seen those who knew him in Boston and in the obscure villages of Maine and Vermont; and the pictures given by each, and by the poor peasants of France, are all the same; and all agree with the general impression of his character which is left by the work before us. Everywhere the same gentleness, simplicity, modesty; the same firmness, intrepidity, and meekness.

His deep and ready insight into man was a natural result of the quick sympathies, which brought him at once into close contact with others. We have no evidence that he possessed remarkable powers of thought. His capacity for abstract subjects, we apprehend, was small. Nor have we evidence that he was able to search into those principles of truth, which are the central energies of the moral world, or comprehend those broad views of man and society, in conformity to which all great measures of social improvement must be carried out.

We have sometimes heard his name mentioned in connexion

with that of Fenelon. They belong to entirely distinct orders. They were alike pure and simple-minded, alike humble and devoted. But the purity, simplicity, humility, and self-sacrifice of Fenelon were entirely different from the same qualities in Cheverus. Fenelon moves through a wider sphere, he reaches farther into the soul of things, and has a more purely spiritual existence. His personal influence was not so much less, as the influence of his works is broader and more enduring. We can imagine circumstances under which Fenelon might have performed all that was done by Cheverus; but we cannot conceive it possible that Cheverus should ever have left behind the legacy by which Fenelon has enriched the world. The one we regard as a model of action, a spur to the thoughtless, sluggish, or selfish spirit; to the other we turn in the hour of sadness and doubt, and in the season of solitary thought, when we would rise above the interests of the day, and feast on visions of immortal hope. As one possessing that happy combination of faculties, which fits man for a life of active beneficence, it would be hard to find the parallel of Cheverus. In the quickness of his human sympathies, and the tenderness of his devotional feelings, his heart was that of a child. But beyond these qualities, and in harmony with them, is a higher life, which belongs more entirely to the soul. There is a sensibility purely spiritual, through which the mind lies open to divine impressions, as the flower unfolds itself to the light. There is a depth and clearness of spiritual perception, like that of the peaceful waters in which are mirrored the very depths of the overarching heavens. There is a spiritual calmness and energy, which bears the soul up like the unseen power that, moving the ocean and the winds, carries planets and stars forever onward in their course. There is a union of the soul with God, a concert of the human and the Divine will, through which the thoughts of the good man are one with the dictates of eternal truth. From this subjection of the human to the Divine nature, this blending of the soul with God, this unison between the motions of the human mind and the promptings of the Infinite Spirit, springs a purely spiritual peace, which, "filling the soul, as God does the universe, silently, and without noise," is its life — the consummation of its hope — the marriage of earth and heaven. Thus man rises above the sphere of mortality, and looks down, with the feelings of an angel, upon all the interests, the struggles and passions, the hopes and sorrows, of life.

We had wished to dwell on other features in the life of Cheverus. His decision, his delicate respect for the aged, — an uncommon virtue, in these days, — his firmness, his regular employment of time, — rising at four in summer, and half past four in winter, that he might secure time for study before the duties of the day began, — his preaching, — these and other topics might each form the subject of an entire discourse. But we leave our readers to find the text and make the commentary for themselves.

In no instance was Cheverus advanced to a more dignified station without doing all in his power to prevent it; and often, by his exertions, did he escape from what others would have regarded as desirable preferments. His reluctance to be dragged into distinguished places was never stronger than when he was appointed cardinal, in February, 1836. "You have often," he wrote to a powerful friend in Paris, "professed to be my friend. Give me a proof of your sincerity by stopping a project, which fills me with pain. I am already too high. Suffer me, I beseech you, to die as I am." The appointment was made, and he was called to Paris to receive the insignia of office from the hands of the king. Still he was heavy and sad, as if weighed down by some great calamity. The attentions of a court, the honors of a world, had no charm for him. "What," he asked, "is the difference, after death, between a black, a violet, and a crimson shroud? When one has seen thrones falling, and society every day threatened to its foundation, how can he feel that there is anything solid here!" The new dignity oppressed him.

He returned from Paris through his native place. There he was received with every mark of respect. Still the same feelings continued. In preaching, he spoke only of death, and the necessity of preparing to appear before God. "Most of those, whom I once knew in this place, are gone. Death has carried them all away. It is a lesson to me, teaching that I also must soon go."

At Bordeaux an immense procession met him, and he was received with all the honors which gratitude, affection, and respect could bestow. But his days were numbered. Overcome by his excessive labors in an excursion through the rustic parts of his diocese, during the oppressive heat of summer, he returned to Bordeaux quite exhausted, on the 2d of July. He had always prayed that his death might be sudden; his prayer

was answered. On the 13th of July he was seized by an apoplectic fit, which deprived him of his senses. He lingered along unconsciously till the 19th, when peacefully and without a struggle he expired.

For two days the coffin was permitted to remain in the church, where all ranks and conditions crowded round to see for the last time the features of him who had been the father and the friend of all; and as they stood, with eyes fixed on his marble countenance, their sobs were interrupted only by broken words of grateful affection.

It is good for us to dwell on an example like this. It gives enlargement to our minds, breaking away the little party feelings that sometimes gather round us. When we see, in the most corrupt church on earth, such men as Sir Thomas More, and Fenelon, and Cheverus,—when we see such men as Hooker, Herbert, and Leighton, Sir Henry Vane, John Milton, and William Penn, men who belong to the whole world, scattered through different religious denominations, we feel how unnatural are those distinctions, that would shut up all goodness within a single sect; and we feel, too, the richness of the Divine mercy, which, under every form of worship, brings to honest and devout hearts all that is essential to their life. Veil the truth as you may, beneath the clouds of human error, pinion it down as you can, by lifeless forms, when the true and large heart comes, these clouds become transparent, and dead forms, instinct with life. There men gather together, and go away enriched by a new revelation of the Divine love. Not the place or the form,—it is the soul, that speaks. Forms and creeds, churches and appointed meetings, language, tones and looks, are but the changing instruments through which the unchanging "word" is to be impressed upon the human soul. Where the truth is struggling for utterance, there it will be heard; and were no other lesson than this taught by his life, we should receive with joy the memorial of every good man. Examples of genius we view afar off, as objects of admiration; but an example of simple, unaffected goodness, is within the reach of all, and calls upon us all to *be* what we admire.

J. H. M.

Art. VII. — Remarks on the Character and Genius of Sir Walter Scott.

Of all branches of literature Biography awakens the deepest and most universal interest. It begins earliest, and continues longest. It is the delight of our childhood, the study of maturer years, and the amusement and solace of declining life. And there is good reason why it should be so. Man cannot be an object of indifference to man. Nature asserts and maintains her rights over the coldest and most selfish. "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin;" and this strong instinctive sense of *community* and kindred has bound the world together from the days of Adam until now. Brutal ignorance, and its offspring, inveterate prejudice, fierce war, and savage passion, have been able to modify or pervert, but never to extinguish it. The problem of human life is one of deep and fearful interest to every man that lives; and the life even of the humblest, could we but catch the right point of view, has in it an epic dignity and grandeur, that well entitle it to our study and regard. Our sympathies are with man — with individual man; not with masses; still less with philosophical abstractions and generalizations. This is the reason why history generally is so cold, dull, and unprofitable. The spirit of philosophy, as it is called, is not a life-giving spirit. In its investigation of abstract truth, of general *causes*, it loses sight of living agents, till its historical personages become thin, shadowy, and unaffecting. They stir not our passions and affections, because they have none of their own. We regard them much in the manner of algebraic characters, that are expected, of course, to work out certain results; and we cherish a certain degree of curiosity to see what these results shall be, and to note the process as it goes on; but little of heartfelt interest, and true sympathy. Nor can we. Pure reason is not the medium in which sympathy works. It is by the imagination and affections, that the will is moved, the active energies controlled, and the character formed; and these are conversant with individualities alone. When Sterne wished to make an indelible impression of the horrors of slavery, he wisely selected a single figure, and, by portraying this, produced a more eloquent and effective appeal than he could have done by a hundred volumes of abstract reasoning.

Our sympathies, we repeat, are with individual man; our interest revolves round beings like ourselves. We speculate, indeed, on universal truths; and the scientific man doubtless enjoys a high degree of satisfaction, often, in the discovery and contemplation — though principally in the *former* — of the abstractions of pure science. For the reason is a legitimate and essential faculty of the soul, and its exercise and cultivation are accompanied by their appropriate pleasures. But, after all, the deep, living, and moving interest of man, turns on the practical weal or wo, the struggle, the success, the disappointments, the hopes and fears, the loves and hatreds, of his fellows on the great arena of human life. Thus do we regard the history of an individual. It is to general history what, in physical science, experiment is to theory, — at once its illustration and its test. It fixes and exemplifies general principles, and enables us, by seeing their, action, to perceive their uses. It is a law of our mental constitution, that practical truths — those that are capable of being shown in action — are held, as it were, with a doubting and imperfect conviction, till they *are* so seen. And this serves to explain the interest we feel in biography, which portrays causes in their effects, and principles in their actual results; and, at the same time, it illustrates its usefulness. There is that in the experience of the most obscure individual, could it be brought out, and presented in its proper light, which is worthy the regard of the highest and most cultivated mind. For life and death, the business and concernment of the lowliest, are likewise the business and concernment of the loftiest; and their respective courses are only different solutions of the same problem. But when an individual passes away, who has filled the world with his name, who has awed at once and elevated our spirits by the exhibition of high powers of thought or of action, our desire is naturally so much the more intense and eager to learn how it was done. It is a study to which the public attention may be called again and again, by different minds, and never without profit. And such a man, in our opinion, was Sir Walter Scott.

The childhood and boyhood of Scott seem to have been very much like those of other men in similar circumstances of life. No very striking indications of peculiar genius, or genius of any sort, so far as we can perceive, were visible in his earlier years. The beautiful anecdote of the thunderstorm, when he was found, while yet almost an infant, lying on the ground, and

clapping his hands with delight at the successive flashes of lightning, crying "bonny, bonny," may, perhaps, be alleged as an exception to the truth of this remark. We shall not question its application, though, as it strikes us, the mind of Scott, in mature life, was less remarkable for deep sympathy with the grand sublimities of nature, than for a lively perception and keen sense of beauty. Had the anecdote been told us of Burns, we should have felt that it was in perfect keeping, and hailed it as an appropriate augury and foreshowing of "Bruce's Address."

But we are free to say, that we have, generally, no very implicit faith in these prophetic indications of childhood. They are very liable to be read with partial eyes, and recorded in very *accommodating* memories. The child is, we doubt not, as Wordsworth says, the father of the man; but we apprehend this is a truth learned rather by general reasoning, and on psychological principles, than by a careful induction of facts. And, moreover, we are of opinion that these indications are very frequently *ex post facto* discoveries. We read the character of the child by light reflected from that of the man. Till brought to this test, its impress, like characters traced in sympathetic ink till held to the fire, is apt to remain illegible.

Remarkable children, we believe, are mostly so in consequence of some morbid and premature development, that gives a disproportionate prominence to some faculty; and, to the eye of sober judgment, betokens anything rather than a full and rich maturity of high and well balanced powers. And where this is not the case, children, that we are apt to regard as of the highest promise, are generally such as are noted for a certain pliancy of disposition, which we misname docility, such as yield most readily to external impressions, to the influence of those about them; soft clay, that readily takes the form of the mould into which it is cast.

There is such a love of power inherent in the human character, so much gratification in perceiving the ascendancy of our own judgment, that even the wisest and the best are apt to over-estimate the endowments of a child of the character we have described. For the same reason we seldom do full justice to those of a firmer and more decided bent, whose will is made of sterner stuff, and therefore less easily controlled; and who early manifest a certain satisfaction in stemming the current of authority. And yet, an element very much akin to what we

call obstinacy, and capable, by mistreatment, of fatal perversion, is, perhaps, an essential ingredient in every vigorous and energetic character. Temperament has much to do — we know not how much — in determining the form and the course of the intellectual development. And temperament never changes. So far, then, as this is concerned, the indications of childhood, read aright, may be safely trusted. The temperament of Scott, though a genial and kindly one, was of a firm and decided character. Not that he was self-willed and headstrong; but he early manifested, that he had within him a resolute and self-sustaining power, upon which, when occasion required, he could quietly fall back, and from which it was no easy matter to dislodge him. This is substantially his own statement of the case; and it is verified in the whole course of his subsequent life. And this habitude, we think, was cherished and strengthened by a circumstance in his condition, which, on a temperament less genial, might have wrought the most disastrous effects. We allude to his lameness. This defect would have been very likely to sour the temper and pervert the affections, — as in the case of Lord Byron, — or else to break down the spirit, of one less favorably constituted. In his case it did neither. It only threw him more entirely on his own resources; and thus tended to strengthen and concentrate his powers. As the occasion, too, of his being withdrawn for a time from the city, and placed amid the wild scenery of the country, it gave opportunity and scope for his young imagination to expand its powers, and become familiar with the beauties of nature, at a time of life when the impressions of outward objects form themselves readily into permanent elements of the character.

Here, too, were first opened to his mind those fountains of traditionary lore and wild minstrelsey, from which his genius, in after times, was destined to draw so copiously for the wonder and delight of the world. So that it would not, perhaps, be too much to say, that to this accident we are mainly indebted for the greatest novelist the world has ever seen. A striking instance of that beautiful moral alchemy, by which a well ordered spirit transmutes evil into good, and out of weakness educes strength! Had the boy Walter Scott been furnished with two sound feet, he might have made his way on them no farther than to the Parliament Close; the future Author of Waverley might have attained, perhaps, to the distinction of sitting

as head of the Scottish Bar, and King of Roysterers, for the portrait of his own Pleydell, could the hand have been found to copy him; and his connexion with the "Heart of Mid Lothian" would have been widely diverse from that which he now sustains.

At school, though he gave abundant evidence of talent, he seems never to have been distinguished for scholarship; nor did he ever, in after times, attain to *eminence* in any branch of learning or science, properly so called. With the mighty masters of Greek and Roman lore, excepting so far as mere "substance of doctrine" was concerned, he had but a slight acquaintance; with the former none at all. Of their *peculiar* modes of thought, of the *mysteries* of their art, of their wonderful skill in the use of their weapons, their exquisite adaptation of the expression to the thought, their elaborate and consummate perfection of finish, which may be imitated, but can never be excelled, — of all this he seems never to have attained more than a dim perception. And his splendid success as a writer, notwithstanding this deficiency, will doubtless be alleged, as it has often been already, by the half-thinkers of the day, as a proof of the inutility of classical studies. It were sufficient, perhaps, to reply, that Scott himself, in the maturity of his judgment and the height of his fame, was of a very different way of thinking. He always regretted this defect in his early education, and deeply reproached himself with his negligence in this regard. And we think it not difficult to trace to this source the blemishes — for such there are, and not a few — to be found in his generally vigorous and picturesque style. He became eminent as a poet and novelist, not because he neglected his lessons to tell or to hear romantic tales and border legends, but notwithstanding this neglect, and in spite of it. And his case, rightly understood, is to be regarded, as he himself regarded it, not as an example, but as a warning. It is getting to be a favorite doctrine, we perceive, not only that the study of the dead languages is of little use, but, moreover, that the true principle to be pursued in the education of the young is to follow the bent of the pupil's genius — in other words, his inclination. Studies to which the young mind manifests a strong repugnance, it is said, can be of little avail, and ought to be foregone. The pathway of the mind, from its very outset, must be strown with flowers, or it can lead to no beneficial results.

Now, not to insist on the fact, that, in nine cases out of ten, to follow the bent of the boy's mind would carry us, not to class-rooms, but to the play-ground, we deny the soundness of the principle altogether, in all its parts, and in all its bearings. In the first place, most boys have no decided bent, no distinct preference for any one course of *mental action*, rather than another. It is impossible they should have. Preference implies previous comparison and judgment; and these they have no means of exercising. The general and original preference, as hinted above, is for idleness or sport. Any apparent inclination for one course of study, rather than another, must usually, in the period of boyhood, be the result of whim or childish fancy, and be liable to fluctuate with the changing hour. And, in the next place, allowing that a child should show a decided disrelish for a system of mental culture, approved by the judgment of the wise, and sanctioned by the experience of ages, even then, we hesitate not to say, it were desirable, that, by proper means, his repugnance should be overcome. Childhood has, by divine appointment, been placed under the supervision of age; and apparently for this very purpose, that its imperfect views should be rectified, and its misjudgments overruled, by those of maturer thought and larger experience. To leave the decision of its course to its own election, were to contravene the purposes of Heaven, — to subject experience to inexperience, caution to rashness, and the mature judgment to the unripe. No child whatever, and very few in the period of youth, is qualified to determine, we say not, what would, on the whole, be best for him, but what he himself, at a maturer season, will actually prefer. The soberer judgment of the parent or guardian may err on this point, it is true; but surely it is more likely to decide correctly than that of the child. Neither, again, is it true, that that course of mental and moral discipline is necessarily most effective, that is most in accordance with the inclination of its subjects. We make this proposition in its broadest and most unqualified import. It is not necessary that discipline, in its earlier stages especially, should be pleasing to the subject, in order to be productive of its best results. This may appear a paradox to some; but it will appear so only so long as it is superficially considered. It is not on this principle that nature conducts the education of her children; and nature is wiser than man. She does not train her pupils in the school of indulgence. On the contrary, she baptizes the soul of man in

sorrow and in tears, and reads him many a lesson of a stern and severe import. She discourses to him of preferences to be set aside, pleasures to be foregone, and toils to be endured in his appointed course. And there is deep truth and wisdom in her words. Does not the great Teacher, too, inculcate it, as the first lesson, on his disciples, to deny themselves, and take up their cross?

One of the wisest and best men we have ever known, in whose family it was once our lot to be domesticated for a time, was in the habit of replying to his children, when they remarked at table, as children sometimes will, that they did not like this or that species of food set before them, — "Then eat it till you do." If this direction is a sound and judicious one in regard to food for the body, it is manifestly both more just and more important in its application to the nutriment of the mind. For, in regard to this, if honestly pursued, it will never fail to effect its object. The most irksome study, if resolutely plied, will not only increase our knowledge and invigorate our powers; it will, without fail, become at length a source of pleasure, as well as profit. It is, then, neither tyrannical nor unwise, when we have satisfied ourselves that a particular course of mental discipline is adapted, on general principles, better than any other, to develop and mature the faculties of the soul, to insist, that the young, who are placed under our care, shall pursue this course. In this way we are likely to consult their best interests. We have all the security for this, that the nature of the case admits; and with this we may well be satisfied. — These remarks, if they have any weight, are pertinent to the question with which we started: — the usefulness of classical studies, as an instrument of *general* education.

The legitimate object of this education, be it remembered, is not to make mechanics, or artists, or professional men; but something prior to this, and more extensive; — to make *men;* to bring out those powers of intellect and imagination common to all, in full vigor and harmonious proportion. That course of instruction, which most effectually accomplishes this object, is the best course; and, in measure and degree, what is good for one mind, in its early progress, is good for all. In this point of view, any system of education is imperfect and defective in proportion as it is *particular* and *exclusive.* The *true* system must rest on the broad basis of humanity. It must be principally concerned with that which touches man as man; which

belongs alike to all; and without which, art, refinement, and civilization could have no existence. And what is this but language, the symbol and the measure of truth and falsehood, the medium of thought and feeling, the electric chain that transmits the mysterious sympathies of the soul, the magic wand, with which the universal mind of man works its wonders? In every sound system of education, then, the study of language *must* occupy a prominent place; and the experience of ages has decided, that, of all languages, those of Greece and Rome afford the best subjects for studying the philosophy of expression; and their literature, the finest models for imitation. These languages, in former times and other countries, may probably have received an undue share of attention. In some instances such may still be the fact. But we think, their exclusion from our systems of liberal culture would inflict a serious and irreparable injury on the cause of sound learning. We believe, that their place is incapable of being adequately supplied. Not to speak of the beautiful mechanism of their construction, which gives them almost the accuracy and precision of a science, they exercise, on another account, a mastery over the finer elements of our nature, that nothing modern can possess. They speak to us of the awful past, the region of poetry and inspiration. They present themselves to our spirits in the venerable garb of *hoar antiquity*. Every phrase, every word, becomes to the imagition a time-hallowed relic, surrounded with the "religious light" of ancient days. They have a natural tendency to idealize our conceptions, and to elevate the tenor of our thoughts. They lift us out of the poor environment of paltry and trivial affairs, and make us walk with gods and godlike men.

> "Largior hic campos æther et lumine vestit
> Purpureo."

And is this nothing? And shall we again be asked, for the thousandth time, what is the *use* of classical studies? "We are not careful to answer" this inquiry. We recollect, that, not long ago, a potentate, of the utilitarian school unquestionably, proposed to pull down the Egyptian pyramids to furnish *quarry* for canal building; and there are men, we doubt not, wise in their generation, who would scour the helmet of Achilles, should it fall in their way, to convert it into a kitchen utensil. Peace be with such.

From school Scott was transferred, in due time, to the university; where, according to his own account, the same desultory habits of study, — alternate efforts and idleness, — and the

same love of legendary lore, and appetite for multifarious reading, which had marked him at school, continued to distinguish him still. The warmth and heartiness of his manners made him, as aforetime, the favorite of his acquaintances; and he was loved, admired, and *hindered*, by the young men who preferred — when did young men *not* prefer? — good companionship to severe studies. Not that his associates were idlers alone; such was by no means the case. Neither was he idle in any sense that implies inertness and inactivity of mind. He could only be called so in reference to regular and steady application to prescribed studies. In his idlest hours his mind, in its own devious way, was storing itself with that wondrous wealth of antiquarian learning, historical and traditionary, which it afterwards poured forth in so broad and deep a flood.

From his childhood his father had destined him to the Scottish bar; and to see him figure there in the advocate's gown, seems to have been the limit of the worthy man's ambition. Fortune could bestow, his fancy could paint, no distinction more splendid. In order to the attainment of this, he was rather prematurely withdrawn from attendance on the college lectures, and articled as an apprentice in his father's office. In due time he was called to the bar; but in this field, though his attendance at terms was regular for some years, he never reached any high distinction. Themis is said to be a jealous goddess, unapt to bestow her smiles on those who offer her divided homage.

In 1799 he was appointed sheriff of Selkirkshire; a circumstance that, in rendering him less dependent on his profession, was not likely to stimulate his devotion to it. He says himself, of the practice of the law, in the words of Slender, that "there was not, from the first, much love between them, and that little it pleased Heaven, on further acquaintance, to decrease."

Vigorous and versatile as were the talents of Scott, and conscious as, in some degree, he must have been, of possessing them, he seems to have been in no haste to realize any visions of future fame, which he may have indulged. On the contrary, if he actually understood, at this time, his own destination, he approached it slowly and cautiously, and feeling his way before him. His first publications consisted of translations from the German; by which, in a literary point of view, little was to be either gained or lost. His next undertaking, the "Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border," was of a more extensive

and ambitious character, and one that furnished occasion for the display of his exhaustless erudition on the subject of Scotch antiquities.

The work was well received, and made him favorably known as a profound antiquary, and a lively and agreeable writer. Beyond this it did not go. As a poet he was, as yet, little known beyond the circle of his immediate acquaintance. And, though it is evident, we think, that he was already, if not earlier, looking to literature as a profession, — as a source, not only of fame, but of fortune, — yet his estimate of his own powers and pretensions as a writer, up to this period, seems to have been sufficiently humble. The truth, probably, is, that having had, as yet, no great practice in original composition, he had not acquired the facility and confidence that practice alone can give. His mind was fraught with varied stores of information; but he wanted, as yet, the skill to turn them readily — so readily, at least, as afterwards — to use. He was encumbered, probably, with the weight of his own armor.

That he thought altogether too meanly of his own talents as a writer, is evident from the readiness — and more than readiness — with which he undertook to play second to M. G. Lewis, as a contributor to his publication called "Tales of Wonder." He seems actually to have felt himself honored and elevated by the notice of this literary coxcomb. And yet he numbered among his personal friends, at this time, some of the finest spirits and ripest scholars of the age. He doubtless attained, in time, to a juster estimate of Lewis; but he was always disposed to think more highly of others' talents than of his own. He had no touch of the restless, exacting, and overweening vanity, so apt to attach to those who are authors by profession. In his multifarious productions, and in his extensive and unrestrained correspondence, it is not possible, we think, to detect a trace of this weakness.

It has often been objected against him, indeed, that he was in the habit of speaking in terms of disparagement of literature itself, as compared with other objects of ambition, and other modes of social distinction. This objection has, we admit, some appearance of justice; but, we think, little else than appearance. He certainly did not habitually seem to *value* himself — to indulge any sentiments of self-glorification — on his literary productions. His self-estimation was, we believe, to a much greater degree than is common among authors, inde-

pendent of these. He needed not, for the daily sustenance and health of his spirit, the incense offered at the altar of authorship. He could live and enjoy his being without it. And this, we think, is the whole of the matter. We are far from believing that he undervalued literature, or the legitimate and honorable distinctions that eminence in the cultivation of it confers. We do not believe that he postponed these distinctions, in his own mind, to those of rank and wealth. We see, in his whole life, no evidence of all this; and we cannot suppose that he alone should have been insensible to what is obvious to all the world besides, that his proudest distinction, were he ten times a baronet, or even a duke, would still have consisted in being the Author of the Waverley Novels. It should be kept in mind, in order to catch the true spirit of his language on this subject, that he was eminently social in his disposition, and active in his habits; and that these circumstances must necessarily affect, in some degree, his views of life, and its various pursuits. He could never have been, voluntarily, a retired and solitary student, satisfied with studious toil for its own sake. Action was more congenial with his temperament than repose; the bustle and throng of the world, rather than the sequestered retreat. He sought not quiet, but enjoyment — vigorous and positive enjoyment. Such a man could not, naturally, speak of poetry, for example, in the same terms as a contemplative spirit like that of Wordsworth would suggest, any more than the latter could have poured forth the trumpet-tongued battle strains of "Marmion," while spurring his war-horse along the surf-beaten strand. Yet the former may have had as true a sense of poetic beauty, and as just a value for literature, as the latter. The difference seems to be, that, while both could "turn and wind a fiery Pegasus," Sir Walter, at the same time, could manage, and delighted in managing, a mere earthly charger. He seems, in truth, never to have regarded his literary pursuits, whatever value he may have set upon them, as the whole of his being. He had other things to live for besides these, and did not feel that he must either be poet, or be nothing. His inspiration was hardly of that sort, which controls and overmasters the spirit. On the contrary, in his case, "the spirit of the prophet was subject to the prophet." He held all his faculties subject to the guidance of his own will. He evoked no demon, that he could not lay.

If all this must be held to imply, that his genius, because it

did not absorb and overpower him, was not of the highest order, — be it so. Such, most certainly, is not our view of the subject; but the *fact* is undeniable. He was not altogether a poet, or even an author. There was, we are well aware, a secular side to his mind; and he was, in disposition and capability, quite as much, perhaps, a man of the world, in the true sense of these terms. He was a keen sportsman, an assiduous farmer, one who gloried in expatiating amid groves of his own planting; and, besides all this, and much more, one who, according to his own confession, loved a drum and a soldier as well as Uncle Toby himself. In short, he was a man, it seems to us, rather of great energy and large endowments, than of any original and exclusive bent of mind. An energy that, in other times, and under other modes of society, might have shown itself, not in gathering up and embalming the legends of romantic adventure, but in providing work of this sort for future collectors. Poetry, in fine, was his business, not his all, — his occupation, not himself. And again we say, if these admissions, when fairly weighed, must be considered as detracting from his claims as a man of genius, in the high and hallowed acceptation of that term, be it so. This is not the place to enter on a discussion of this point. We may, perhaps, return to it hereafter. At present we will only say, that there is a tone of criticism somewhat prevalent, in this regard, which, with a show of elevation and spirituality, strikes us as essentially crude and superficial.

In 1805 appeared the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," which may properly enough be considered the first in the long series of his original publications. Its success was splendid, beyond, perhaps, that of any preceding poem in the language. It appeared at the right time. The old school of poetry had, sometime before, died out, from utter inanition; that of the Lakes was hardly yet organized. The public had long since been wearied *usque ad nauseam* with stale moralizing and vapid sentimentality. Southey was, indeed, in the field, and Southey is himself a poet. But neither his poetry, nor that of Wordsworth, had hitherto attained much vogue. Neither of them, we are of opinion, is likely to become extensively *popular*. They are, and will continue to be, Wordsworth especially, for study, rather than for amusement or delight. Scott's poetry met and supplied the very want of the time. It was full of life, and splendor, and romantic adventure, and spirit-stirring

incidents. It was buoyant with a wild and irregular energy, that captivated the imagination, and hurried away the judgment. It was popular, in short, in its essence and in its forms; and its favor with the public, of all ranks and degrees, was unbounded. No instance, that we are aware of, can be found in the previous history of literature, of a reputation, at once so extensive and so brilliant, thus suddenly acquired. His bark was now fairly afloat, and both wind and tide bore it onward triumphantly. But it is not our purpose minutely to trace his course. The "Lay" was soon followed by "Marmion;" for the copy of which, before a line was written, he was offered a thousand guineas, such was the confidence reposed in the power of his name. And it proved to the publisher, such was the extent and rapidity of the sale, a most profitable bargain. The publication of Scott's works, indeed, formed an era not only in the literary, but the commercial history of his native city; and Edinburgh became thenceforth the rival of London in the business of *the trade.*

His other poetical works followed in rapid succession, and, for a time, with little or no diminution of favor. Towards the close of the series, however, the interest of the public evidently began to flag. Scott was quick to discern the symptoms, and much too wise to prolong his notes and persist in pouring his strains into reluctant ears. With characteristic promptitude he "changed his hand," and threw off, with a copiousness and rapidity that astonished the world, a succession of different, though kindred productions, "the like of which no eye hath seen." The Waverley Novels, take them for all in all, have certainly no parallel in our language; nor, so far as we know, in any other. Instances may be found of authors who have written as much, though these are rare; but none, we believe, who has produced works at once so numerous, so extensive, and of so high an order. Whether the author is to be regarded as belonging to the highest order of genius, or not, it must be granted that they exhibit a fertility of resources, a readiness of conception, and a power and facility of execution, seldom or never equalled.

In a review of the life of Scott, however rapid, it is impossible to pass over the great practical error of his life; an error, the consequences of which embittered the current of his declining years, broke down his health, hastened the decay of his faculties, and brought him to a premature grave. We say

premature; and it was so; for he had an iron frame, and, but for the inordinate and exhausting drudgery which he imposed on himself, might have carried an unbroken constitution of body and mind to his eightieth year. We allude, of course, to his connexion with the Ballantynes. The pamphlet, lately published by "the trustees and son of the late Mr. James Ballantyne," certainly presents a view of the business transactions of the parties concerned therein very different from that which we, on the authority of Mr. Lockhart, had supposed to be the true one. At least, it renders clear what Mr. Lockhart had left perplexed and obscure; obscure, as we feel ourselves compelled to say, in consequence of what seem to us intentional misstatements, or false colorings, at the best. This, we are aware, is a heavy charge; but we do not see how it is to be evaded. We felt, on perusing this gentleman's life of Sir Walter, as, we doubt not, many others did, that his pecuniary transactions with the Ballantynes, and with Constable and Co., were, in a great measure, unintelligible. We thought this might in part, at least, be owing to the fact, of which we were conscious in ourselves, and suspected in him, that neither we nor Mr. Lockhart were very great adepts in the mysteries of book-keeping. We had no suspicion of sinister purposes on his part. Still, nothing, we think, can be clearer, than that Mr. Lockhart intended to convey the impression, that, in the money transactions between Sir Walter and the Ballantynes, the latter were the parties obliged; that the benefits were wholly theirs; and that, to their extravagance, or mismanagement, or both, the embarrassments, and, finally, the bankruptcy, of the former, were to be ascribed. This certainly was our own impression; and though, as we have already remarked, the case was by no means clearly made out, yet we entertained no doubt of its substantial correctness. It is now, we think, quite obvious, that the facts were not so. From the *bookselling* concern, indeed, in which alone the younger of the brothers had anything to do, it is plain, from Mr. Lockhart's own account, that Sir Walter sustained no loss. Yet,—and this, we think, is one of the strongest evidences of unfairness on the part of Mr. Lockhart,—his name and movements continue to be mixed up with the affairs of Sir Walter, as if, in some way or other, his errors and follies had an effective agency in bringing about the final catastrophe. This remark did not escape us in reading Lockhart's account; and we were struck, too, with the obvious fact, that there was a great

discrepancy between the dispositions of Sir Walter and those of his biographer towards both the Ballantynes.

However this may be, it is Lockhart's good name which is chiefly brought into question in this pamphlet. We do not perceive that the statements which it contains materially affect the character of Sir Walter Scott. They certainly bring no stain upon his integrity and uprightness. These remain, in our judgment, unquestioned and unquestionable. It was certainly unfortunate that he should have made the transfer of his real estate at the time he did. Nay, we are free to say, that, all things considered, he ought not to have done it. It was indiscreet, and furnished but too plausible occasion for reproach. But of the remotest purpose of defrauding his creditors, or circumventing them in any way or manner, he was wholly incapable. In fact, the interest he still retained in this property, had his creditors chosen to lay hold of it, would have gone near to discharge his own personal liabilities. The failure of Constable had involved him to nearly double the amount of these; the whole running up to the frightful sum of near half a million of dollars. Still the creditors chose to forego this interest, and look for indemnity to his future exertions. The event showed that, as "children of this world," they decided wisely.

The trials of great and well-ordered minds furnish the occasions of their most signal triumphs. And so it was with Scott. How he could bear the test of unprecedented popularity and success, the world had already seen. It was now to witness how he would acquit himself under the sterner teachings of adversity. He shrunk not from the encounter, nor suffered the blow to overwhelm him. With indomitable resolution he set himself to redeem his engagements, in the only way in which he could, — by carrying his literary reputation and talents into the market, by the labors of his own brain, the produce of his pen. A Herculean task, before which the most resolute spirit might well have quailed, and the thought of attempting which, but a few years before, would have been regarded, in any one, as little less than insanity. And what he boldly undertook he pursued with an industry and efficiency perhaps never surpassed. He spared not himself either in health or in sickness, but tasked his faculties to the uttermost. Domestic sorrows, too, and bitter bereavement came to mingle gall in his cup. "Some natural tears he shed, but wiped them soon," and addressed himself to his task.

Nothing was suffered to deter him from his purpose, or cause him to falter in its execution. The creditors of Constable, as we have said, having no hope elsewhere, looked to him for the payment of their claims; and they stood by, cormorants that they were, and permitted him to coin his heart's blood to replenish their coffers, and shook, with no gentle hand, the sands that were measuring out his departing hours. He accomplished his purpose, but at fearful cost. His bodily and mental powers gave way beneath the pressure; and the harp of the minstrel, and the romancer's wand, were broken in the grasp of death. Thus toil and sorrow, the energies of the mind overstretched, the burdens of meridian life imposed on declining powers, did their work; and the grave, in very kindness and commiseration, closed over that venerable form, from which the intellectual orb had been already unsphered, or overspread with "dim eclipse."

The life and character of Scott are full of instruction, and rich in moral uses. They are themes which we delight to dwell upon. Amidst the dandyism and malapertness, the silly affectation, false or exaggerated sentiment, distortion, and caricature, and spasmodic throes, which disfigure so much of the current literature of the day, it is absolutely refreshing to recur to the strong, homely sense, and quiet wisdom of this natural, simple, and manly writer. He has not a spice of artifice or affectation in his manner, or in his works. Cant, of every sort, he held in utter contempt. He needed it not. He had no occasion to "cozen fortune," and attempt to pass himself for more than he was worth. The clear and honest impress of sterling value was on his mind, and on his manners; and his works are the fair counterparts and exponents of these, the honest outpourings of his sound and healthful sentiments, and clear and vigorous intellect. It is the primary excellence of Scott, and his noblest distinction, as a writer as well as a man, that he was a thoroughly *honest* man; honest, in the fullest and broadest sense of the term. This is, to a great degree, the secret and source of his power. There is no discord between the tenor of his language and that of his life; none of that weakness and wavering, which betray a conscious discrepancy between the sentiment and the utterance. The tone of his morality, both in his writings and his conduct, without any parade of prudery or refinement, or one touch of transcendentalism, is uniformly healthy, vigorous, and sustained. It never

pretends to rise above the level of humanity; and it never sinks below it. Humanity and common sense are the prevailing characteristics of his philosophy. Discarding nice distinctions and artificial refinements, it embraces the great interests and relations of human life with a firm and vigorous grasp.

Hence, in his wildest fictions and most romantic adventures, he is a perfectly safe and trustworthy guide. There is no danger that he will lead you to an irretrievable distance from the sentiments or the duties of every-day life, that he will either sap the principles, or pervert the affections. There is no danger, even, that the perusal of his works should induce an overwrought sensibility, or an undue ascendancy of the imagination over the judgment. They coincide, in these respects, with the laws of the mind, as well as the general order of things; and their effects are analogous to those of the great discipline of life. This, we are sensible, is high praise; but, in our judgment, it is justly merited. We know no writer in this department of literature, not even Shakspeare himself, whose claims, in this respect, are of a higher order.

Works of fiction must occupy a large space in the literature of all cultivated communities. There is in all minds, especially of the young and imaginative, a craving for such works, that may not safely be refused. It will be gratified; and it ought to be. The imagination is an essential and important faculty of the mind, and calls for its appropriate culture; and this culture cannot be neglected but at the hazard of the safety and well-being of the soul. For the will is moved and swayed, and the character controlled, not by the understanding alone, but far more by the imagination and affections. It is through these, that error and falsehood assail us in the guise of truth, and lead us captive at their will. Works of fiction, in the wide sense of the terms, have far more influence on the morals of society and the welfare of individuals than works of direct and dogmatic instruction. For good, or for evil, they are, to a great degree, the teachers of sentiment, "the glass of fashion, and the mould of form." Their influence may be decried or depreciated; but no one can deny it. For ourselves, we think that this love of fiction and romance holds of the poetic and the lofty in our nature; and we would not see it extinguished or perverted. We deem it our duty to cherish and direct it; with a wise discretion, certainly, if we may, but by all means to cherish it. And in this regard we consider Scott as one of

the greatest benefactors of society, by furnishing so wide a field, in which the imagination may safely and healthfully expatiate. We can put his works into the hands of those who are dearest to us, whose characters are forming under our eyes and under our influence, and to whom we sustain what we regard as the highest and the holiest of human obligations, without apprehension or misgiving. We have no fears that, by perusing these, their sentiments will be corrupted, their affections perverted, the balance of their powers disturbed, or their vigor enervated. We do not mean, that there is nothing in these works which we would not see changed or omitted; that they are faultless and without a spot. But we do say, that their influence and tendency are, on the whole, decidedly favorable to moral purity and power, to a free, healthy, and vigorous tone of mind and feeling. To this praise — and who will say this is not the highest? — he is certainly entitled.

The example of Scott is of great value, too, in teaching, so forcibly as it does, the perfect compatibility of high genius with plain, practical good sense and the quiet virtues of domestic life. He never thought, for a moment, that his high endowments exempted him from the discharge of any office of affection, or from any exertion to promote the welfare of the humblest of his dependents. There was in him nothing of the petulance and waywardness that have so often disfigured and marred the characters of eminent men. On the contrary, he was remarkably exemplary and amiable in all the walks of social and domestic life. He claimed no privileges, he required no allowances. He was always ready to concede to the wishes and convenience of those about him, and entered into all their pursuits and amusements with the earnest and honest sympathies of a schoolboy. The world needed — it always needs — such an example as this. The prevalent conception of genius is loose and vague; often false and mischievous. It is thought to be something that is strange and peculiar, and walks apart; that it is not to be met with along the beaten highway of life; that its manifestations must be wild, and fitful, and extravagant; and that its temperament must be one that neither the judgment nor the conscience can control. In short, genius, in the vulgar apprehension, has too often been only another name for eccentricity. Now this is not only an error in point of fact and criticism; it is much worse; it is both false in principle, and highly injurious in a moral view. It perverts the judgments and dims the moral

discernment of men. It not only leads them to palliate, but absolutely hallows, the errors, the weakness, and the wickedness of men of eminent endowments. If such a man is tyrannical to his dependents, heartless or brutal to his wife, estranged from the charities of the hearth and the fireside, irregular and distempered in his affections, it is only the irritability and sensitive temperament of genius, and he must not be too severely judged. So deep and general has been this impression, or something like it, that the world is slow to believe, that true genius actually exists, where no extravagance and disproportion is discernible in the character. Now, we take it, that perfect genius necessarily implies *entire harmony* and *proportion* in all the faculties; and that all eccentricity is, so far, an evidence of weakness and imperfection; not a distinction to be coveted and boasted of, but a blot and defect to be deplored, and, by rigorous self-discipline, to be remedied. The truth is, that what are termed the aberrations of genius are, usually, the results of unsteady principles, perverted feelings, or undisciplined desires. With genius they have nothing to do.

Another trait in the character of Scott, both personal and literary, is his simplicity of manner. He has no ambitious pretensions, no affectation of lofty sentiment or profound thought. The style of his conversation was remarkably plain and homely; so much so as to be pronounced by many even coarse and commonplace. So different was it from the strained and elaborate style of those who talk for reputation. Now this, we think, is a virtue of a high order, the characteristic of a truly great mind, as well as an evidence of sound discernment and good taste. We do not think that the obscure, the mystic, the incomprehensible, are the marks of true genius, though they often pass current for such. Truth may, doubtless, sometimes have its place at the bottom of the well; but we see no occasion that, besides this, the water should also be muddy. And we think there is an essential defect in that man's mind, who either cannot form a clear and definite conception of his subject, or, having formed such, cannot communicate it to others. The profoundest thinkers, the world has ever seen, have been as remarkable for the clearness as for the grandeur of their views. In the atmosphere of genius, as in that of nature, the dim and misty regions are not the higher, but the lower.

Our limits will permit us to notice only one more trait in Sir Walter's character. We mean the essential kindness of his

disposition; the warmth and depth of his affections; the *love* with which he embraced every living thing that came within the sphere of his influence. No man had truer or more faithful friends; and no one was ever served with more devoted zeal and fidelity. His domestics were his friends. They regarded him with the reverential affection that marks rather the relation of children to a parent, than the mercenary connexion of master and servant. And he *merited* this steady attachment on the part of his friends, and this respectful affection on the part of his dependents; he could not have possessed them, if he had not. The homage of the heart is never awarded to mere wealth, or station, or power. Nothing but genuine kindness can either acquire or preserve them. There is no such thing as counterfeiting here. There is a freemasonry of the heart, which reads the heart, and detects imposture, at once. "He speaks," said one of his humble friends, "to every body as if they were his own blood relations." Nothing can be added to this eulogy. And it was even so; and he spoke thus to every one, because he felt that, in every man he saw, he actually beheld one that *was* his own blood relation. Nothing but this feeling could have given the uniform tones of kindness to his voice, that awakened a kindred tone in the heart of every one that heard them.

Hence, also, the bland and generous spirit which marked his intercourse with men of letters, his rivals in a greater or less degree, and competitors for fame. He really seems to have been incapable of any touch of envy or jealous irritation. He never felt as if any man crossed his path or intercepted his sunshine; nor will any future historian of the "Quarrels of Authors" be able to derive a page from him. In the whole of his voluminous works, including his correspondence, we doubt whether it is possible to find a single petulant expression or ill-natured allusion to any living man. We know of no instance parallel to this. Yet he was not without trials in this respect, sufficient to have awakened the sentiments of envy and suspicion, had they been sleeping in his breast. His poetic star, at the height of his fame, paled before the meteoric splendor of Byron's ascending orb; and he had been wantonly assailed, too, by his successful rival. Yet no shade of resentment towards Byron seems to have lingered in his mind. Few have even judged more favorably of his powers and good qualities than Scott, or expressed a more generous indulgence for his errors.

But we are admonished that it is time to bring our remarks to a close. We have already exceeded our just limits; but the topic swells under our hands. We deem it one of no slight importance. The works of Scott occupy, and, we think, will continue to occupy, a wide space in the literature of our language; and they lie precisely in that position, as it seems to us, that brings them to bear effectively on the great interests of society. If it be true, as Sir James Mackintosh says, that polite letters form the channel through which moral science has a constant intercourse with general feeling, it is not easy to overestimate the importance of such a class of productions. If their character and tendency be such as we regard them, their author must be considered one of the noblest benefactors of his age; and it behoves society to know and to honor its benefactors. And this duty is specially incumbent where much of the benefit conferred consists in the character and example of the benefactor himself. Such we deem the case of Sir Walter Scott; and, therefore, we regard his character as one with which it is well to be intimately conversant. We would gladly set up its living symbol, in the temple of our memory, as one of those cherished images, by the contemplation of which we might hope to grow wiser and better. Not that we would represent or consider him as a perfect and spotless model, either as an author or as a man. By no means. We look for none such; and we are content to take the example of a great and good man, with its invariable allotment of human frailty, without expecting or requiring immaculate virtue, or consummate wisdom. But we do think that his character presents a rare union of varied excellences, of resolute and active energy with lively sensibility to beauty and loveliness, of fine imagination with strong sense, of ardent patriotism with a large and liberal humanity, and of lofty genius with steady industry, order, and all the quiet virtues, that bless the walks of humble life.

Such examples are not so common, that there is any occasion for the world to forget them or be insensible to their value. Sons of genius are sons of light. Their inspiration is the inspiration of Heaven. Their peculiar gift is a high and a holy thing; and they are sent among men on a mission of love, involving a high responsibility. Alas for them, if they are recreant or unfaithful; but the crown of fidelity is, and ought to be, a crown of glory. For the fidelity of Scott we appeal to those, who read his works or dwell on the records of his life. Do

they not find themselves, on rising from the perusal, in more genial relations with their fellows, more ready to do a generous deed, more disposed to thank God that they live in this beautiful world, filled with a lighter joyousness, or bound in deeper and more touching sympathies with their kind? Let it not be said, that all these benefits might have been obtained elsewhere. Doubtless they might. The world, thank God, is full of them. Infinite goodness and beauty have never left themselves without witness, in the blue heavens, and the green earth, and amid the varied manifestations of human life. But it is something, surely, to have collected them and pointed them out. All sources whence such influences flow, are hallowed. The lights, which radiate joy and love, "are lights from heaven;" and the hand that has kindled them is the hand of an angel.

M. L. H.

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

The Hawaiian Spectator. Volume I. No. I. Conducted by an Association of Gentlemen. January, 1838. Printed for the Proprietors. Honolulu, Oahu, Sandwich Islands. 1838. Edwin O. Hall, Printer. 8vo. pp. 112. — The appearance of the first number of a quarterly journal, published at the Sandwich Islands, and bearing a good comparison, so far as mechanical execution is concerned, with similar publications in this country, took us, we must say, a little by surprise. The objects, which will claim particular attention in this work, are thus stated in the Introductory Observations.

"With a local situation, that affords facilities for concentrating intelligence, probably superior to any other spot in the Pacific, the purpose of our journal will be, to gather from all the sources of information that may be opened upon us, and to combine correct intelligence upon topics connected with the topographical, political, and moral geography of the islands of this ocean and its surrounding continents, — to afford a channel through which the facts that may be evolved in the various departments of natural history and science may be communicated to the world, — to furnish philological information relative to the genius and structure of the various dialects of the Polynesian language, and notices of native literature that may be originated in these dialects, in the progress of the means of education already in use or to be instituted, — to show the extent, facilities, and modes through which commercial enterprises may be conducted, and the means that may be put

in operation to pour through the various channels of commerce a salutary moral influence, and the results realized from such measures, — to notice the forms of government that may be organized by the various islanders, and the relations and terms of intercourse instituted between them and foreign powers, and the tendencies of such intercourse upon the destinies of the weaker parties. It will also be our steady and prominent object, to furnish accurate and definite statements of the efforts in progress to enlighten, civilize, and Christianize the benighted on the Islands of the Pacific, and on the western continent of America, showing what has been accomplished, and what remains to be done; and, from the deeply affecting view of the character and condition of the heathen in their remote alienation from their Maker, — a view derived from actual observation, — we shall earnestly set forth the imperative necessity for vastly greater efforts, in all their forms, than have yet been projected, to enlighten and redeem the world. We shall endeavor to throw light upon the nature of the work to be achieved, the obstacles to be overcome, and the means of overcoming them; and shall exert our last ability to correct and drive out of being the egregious errors which prevail in relation to the world's conversion. — pp. 4, 5.

The work is mainly in the hands of the missionaries, and entirely, we suppose, under their control; so that it can hardly be regarded as an authority, except as giving their account of the matter. Several articles in the present number are valuable; among which, we may mention particularly the fourth, on the Oahu Charity School, the fifth, on Female Education at the Sandwich Islands, the seventh, on the Causes of Decrease of the Native Population in these Islands, and the eighth, Sketches of Kauai. A careful inquiry into the actual decrease of native population has led to the following results.

"By the early navigators in these seas, the inhabitants of the several islands of this group were estimated at not less than 400,000. This was the estimate given by the scientific gentlemen who accompanied Capt. Cook in his voyage of discovery. Subsequent voyagers confirmed the correctness of the estimate. The accounts of the older and more intelligent natives, as well as the indications of a country once extensively cultivated, corroborate the probability of its truth, and prove the fact, that there was once a teeming population flourishing throughout the whole cluster of islands.

"But after the lapse of sixty years they have dwindled down to about 110,000, or about one third of their supposed original number. This estimate was made from a census taken two years since, by the school teachers, under the direction of the missionaries. A similar census had been taken four years previous, and it was ascertained that, during the four intervening years, the diminution of inhabitants throughout the islands was nearly one twelfth of the whole. In 1832 the population amounted to rising 130,000; and in 1836, only to about 110,000. I use the round numbers, as approximating sufficiently near to show a rapid decrease of population in the islands.

. . . "According to this rate of retrogradation, it will take but fifty or sixty years to extinguish every vestige of aboriginal blood in the land. At the present day there are a large number of childless families, who have no heir, of their own blood, to inherit their little property. Perhaps not more than one in four of the families now existing have children of their own now alive!" — pp. 53, 54.

Among the causes, which have contributed to bring about this melancholy state of things, a prominent place is assigned to their oppressive and ruinous system of government.

"It must suffice to say here, that the government claim and exercise the proprietorship of the whole land, and available property thereon, in the hands of their subjects. This is the groundwork of their system, and they are taught from infancy to consider the soil of the islands as theirs in fee simple, and the common people as their tenants, to be continued or removed at pleasure. In the exercise of this claim they permit, or prohibit, to the common people, *ad libitum*, the exercise of any privilege, as appears to them most conducive to their own interests or the general good. As there is no stipulated compact between the lords of the soil, and the tenantry, as to the amount of gratuitous labor or taxation which is to be paid by the latter, it gives to the chiefs an arbitrary power to make exactions as often, and to just such an extent, as they think proper. — p. 56.

This evil, however, bad as it is, and all the others here enumerated, dwindle into insignificance when compared with the two giant destroyers, "*alcohol, and disease propagated through licentious intercourse with white men.*" But the details connected with these topics are so excessively painful and offensive, that we gladly turn from them to brighter prospects, which open on us in the "Sketches of Kauai."

"In the fall of 1835 Messrs. Ladd & Co. obtained from the king a long lease of a large tract of land at Koloa, for the purpose of cultivating the sugar cane. It lies three miles from a good anchorage; the soil is rich, and watered by a fine stream, which affords sufficient water power for the necessary mills.

"During the first year, all the difficulties incidental to a new country, and a total want of agricultural implements, and an ignorant, indolent people, unavoidably retarded the immediate execution of their plans. They at present have eighty acres under cultivation, and intend the ensuing year to cultivate two hundred more. The necessary buildings are now erected, and, in addition to these, a sugar mill will soon be completed at the village below, for the purpose of grinding the cane that may be cultivated by the chiefs and people. The quantity of sugar, which may be exported annually from this valley, is estimated at from two to four hundred tons.

"In 1836 Messrs. Ladd & Co. leased a portion of their land to Messrs. Peck and Titcomb, for the purpose of cultivating the mulberry and raising silk. They have now upwards of forty thousand trees, which, at nine months' growth, are as thrifty and forward as those of several

years, in New England. As yet they have been disappointed in obtaining the silk-worm, but are daily expecting a supply of eggs from China."

"Experiments are also making in the raising of coffee and cotton; which bid fair to be equally as successful, though not so lucrative as sugar or silk.

"As the plan and objects of the two estates are materially the same, the following description and remarks will equally apply to both. With the leases orders were given for thirty-six men, as laborers upon the two estates; as the common people are held rigidly by the chiefs, who consider their dignity enhanced by the number they control, it was with much difficulty that they could be obtained; and when procured, proved to be the offscourings of the island. Of this number nearly one half were soon discharged for various misdemeanors, and punished by the authorities of the place, after a fair and legal trial by jury. To the others, houses with lands to cultivate for their own benefit, were allotted. These were joined by a few stragglers, who seemed to have no master, but proved themselves valuable servants, and now constitute the real population of the plantation.

"A large number of day laborers are also employed. To all, twelve and a half cents per day and their food are allowed. This sum may appear small, but, when compared with their wants, is fully equal to a dollar per day in the United States.

"Mr. Hooper, the gentleman of the firm who has the immediate care of the sugar plantation, estimates the daily cost of furnishing food to each man, which consists of fish and *poi*, at one cent.

"All ardent spirits are tabued by the government, so that none are brought to the island. A superintendent and several other white men are also employed.

"At sunrise all the laborers are turned out by the ringing of the bell, and work till sunset, sufficient time being allowed for their meals. At night they are assembled and paid by a sort of bank note system. These notes are considered as good as money over the whole island. They consist of small pieces of card, upon which are printed different values, and which are redeemable in goods on Saturdays, which time is allotted them to cultivate their lands, and as a general market day, when they make their purchases and bring their produce to be sold. A strict regard is paid, as far as is possible, to their morals and health; the effect of which is perceivable in improvements in their houses and gardens, and in the dresses of their wives and children.

"Their indolent habits are rapidly giving way before the prospect of gain; and the idea of property, the ambition to acquire it, a sense of the value of time and the use of money, are rapidly spreading among them, though, as yet, in a very crude way. Slowly, but surely, their intellects are beginning to comprehend their own rights and importance in the scale of political economy. In proportion to this increase of knowledge, does the servile fear of the chiefs, which has heretofore formed a part of their nature, diminish. This influence is spreading rapidly over the island. Two years since, a chief needed but to breathe his commands, and they were implicitly obeyed. Now he is obliged to stipulate with his men, and allow them a certain proportion of the fruits of their labor."

Sketches of Married Life. By the Author of "The Skeptic," "The Well-Spent Hour," &c. Boston. 1838.—The author of this little book is well known by her easy and earnest style, and by the spirit and moral elevation of her ideas. The story is a short and simple one, yet almost all the subjects, that concern duty and happiness in life, are brought in without straining, and treated in a very interesting manner. The history of Amy Weston and Edward Selman is a valuable exposition of the excellence of truth of character, and the true philosophy of wealth and happiness; while, in Amy's father, we have a true picture of a large class of men, and a too prevalent principle in our land. With Roberts and his fair wife, life does not run so gently as with the former; but their experience well teaches, first sadly, but at last happily, the need of perfect confidence between husband and wife.

There are, doubtless, many who call themselves good Christians, who would think Selman's conduct foolish and Quixotic, in giving up all his property to his creditors; and, especially, in paying his old debts years after he had been legally released from them. The zeal, with which the fair author exhibits his honesty and magnanimity, shows her opinion of the subject.

This book adds one to the many proofs we are every day seeing, that the literature of the affections is to be the peculiar province of woman. A host of bright names already adorns this literature in our own land. There is much in the work before us to call to mind Miss Sedgwick, although the author lacks Miss Sedgwick's admirable tact in the management of the dialogue. However, we do not see how anything could improve the dialogues between Ruth and Jerry. There is, perhaps, a little strained sentimentality in some parts of the book, which Miss Sedgwick would have avoided.

We ought to be glad, that one sensible book has been written upon so important a subject. It may make some families happier, and deter others from rushing headlong into the most important of all connexions, and repenting, when repentance is too late. That no such feelings of repentance are shared by the author, the dedication of the work satisfactorily shows.

Mrs. Grant of Laggan.—The following Obituary Notice of the late Mrs. Grant is taken from "The Edinburgh Evening Courant" of November 22, 1838. The early residence of the subject of it in our country, and, more especially, the kind at-

tention and hospitality with which many of our friends have been received at her house in Edinburgh, render its insertion in our work an appropriate tribute of respect and remembrance.

"The recent death of this distinguished and venerable lady has caused a blank in this metropolis, which will not soon or easily be supplied, and of which those, who regarded merely her advanced age and bodily infirmities, can form no adequate conception. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, Mrs. Grant retained, till a very short time before her death, all her intellectual vigor; and her house continued to be the resort, not only of the friends who delighted in her conversational powers, and in her remarks on the current literature of the day, but also of many distinguished strangers who visited Edinburgh.

"Mrs. Grant's life was, in an eminent degree, eventful. She was born at Glasgow, in the year 1755. Her father, Mr. M'Vicar, was an officer in the British army, and on her mother's side she was descended from the ancient family of Stewart of Invernahyle, in Argyllshire. Shortly after her birth her father accompanied his regiment to America, under the auspices of the Earl of Eglinton, with the intention of settling there, if he should find sufficient inducement for doing so. His wife and infant daughter soon after joined him. They landed at Charleston; and though the child was then scarcely three years of age, she retained, ever after, a distinct recollection of her arrival in America. Her father's conduct had gained him much favor, both with the settlers and with the Indians; and, accordingly, his daughter and her mother were, on their arrival in America, received with so much kindness, and treated with so much hospitality, that Mrs. Grant ever retained the most grateful recollection of the favors she had received, and, to the latest period of her life, nothing gave her more pleasure than to show attention to the inhabitants of America who visited this city.

"During her residence in America, and in the fourth year of her age, she was taught, by her mother, to read, and she never had any other instructor. But she was so apt and diligent a scholar, that, before her sixth year, she had perused the Old Testament, with the contents of which she was well acquainted. About the same age she also learned to speak the Dutch language, in consequence of being domesticated, for some time, with a family of Dutch colonists in the state of New York. Soon after, the sergeant of a Scottish regiment gave her the only lessons in penmanship she ever received; and, observing her love of reading, he presented her with a copy of Blind Harry's *Wallace*, which, by his assistance, she was enabled to decipher so fully, as not only to understand the dialect in which the book was written, but, also, to admire the heroism of Wallace and his compatriots, and to glow with that enthusiasm for Scotland, which, as she herself expressed, ever after remained with her, as a principle of life. Her fondness for reading was universally observed, and, fortunately, procured for her, from an officer of her father's regiment, a copy of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which, young as she was, she studied with much care, and which she afterwards found to be an inestimable treasure. To the diligent study of this book Mrs. Grant, herself, ascribed the formation of her

character and taste, observing, that, whatever she had of elevation of spirit, expansion of mind, or taste for the sublime and beautiful, she owed it all to her familiarity with Milton. The effect of this became so evident, in her conversation and habits, as soon to secure for her the notice of several of the most eminent settlers in the state of New York, and, in particular, to procure for her the friendship of the celebrated Madame Schuyler, whose worth and virtues Mrs. Grant has extolled in her "Memoirs of an American Lady."

"Mrs. Grant's father had, with the view of permanently settling in America, received a large grant of land, to which, by purchase, he made several valuable additions; but, having fallen into bad health, he was advised to leave America, which he did very hurriedly, and without having got his property disposed of. He returned with his wife and daughter to Scotland, about the year 1768, and a few years afterwards he was appointed barrack-master of fort Augustus. Soon after this the Revolutionary war broke out in America, and, before his landed property there could be disposed of, it was confiscated, and thus the chief means, to which the family had to look for their support, were cut off.

"While her father was barrack-master at fort Augustus, the office of chaplain to the fort was filled by the Rev. James Grant, a young clergyman of accomplished mind and manners, and connected with some of the most respectable families in the neighborhood. Mr. Grant was soon afterwards appointed minister of the parish of Laggan, in Inverness-shire, and in the year 1779 he was united in marriage to the subject of this notice. Of this marriage, twelve children were born, four of whom died in comparatively early years; and soon afterwards Mr. Grant, himself, was cut off, in 1801, leaving his widow with a family of eight surviving children.

"When Mrs. Grant went to Laggan she was informed that, not being a Highlander, nor acquainted with the Gaelic language, she might not be very acceptable to the people. But she had a pride and pleasure in surmounting difficulties; and, with this view, she set herself to learn the customs and the language of the people among whom she was to reside; and she soon had the pleasure and happiness of finding that, among all classes of the parishioners, she was received and treated with kindness. Indeed, her unvarying attention to all of them, and especially to the poor, soon secured to her as high a place in their affections as if she had been a native of the district. The far-famed Highland hospitality was but too well known and practised by Mr. and Mrs. Grant, insomuch that it was matter of great surprise to their friends, and even to Mrs. Grant herself, when she afterwards began to reflect upon it, how, with their large family, and their comparatively slender means, it was possible to do so much as they did in this way. But on Mr. Grant's death it was found that debt, to a small amount, remained undischarged. How this was to be met, and how Mrs. Grant was to provide for the education and support of her eight fatherless children, were matters which, it is believed, occasioned more uneasiness to Mrs. Grant's friends than they ever did to herself. She had a firm reliance on the tender mercy of the Father of the fatherless; and, committing herself and her young children to His gracious care, she resolved to exert her best energies in their behalf. And her exertions

were not unavailing. For some time she took the charge of a small farm in the neighborhood of Laggan; but afterwards she found it necessary, in 1803, to remove to the vicinity of Stirling, where she was enabled, with the assistance of her friends, to provide, in the mean time, for her family.

"As a relief from severer and more anxious duties, Mrs. Grant had always found delight in the pursuits of literature; and, having early shown a taste for poetry, she was occasionally accustomed, for the entertainment of her friends, to write verses; and she also, by way of relaxation, carried on an extensive correspondence with some of the friends of her youth. Of her poems, which were generally written with much haste, and on the spur of the moment, her friends formed a much higher opinion than she herself ever did. She generally gave them away, when they were finished, without retaining any copy. It occurred to some of those friends, that a volume of her poems might be published with advantage; and, before she was well aware of their kind intentions, proposals were dispersed all over Scotland for publishing such a volume by subscription. At this time Mrs. Grant had not even collected the materials for the proposed publication; but, in a short period, the extraordinary number of upwards of three thousand subscribers had been procured by her influential friends. The late celebrated Duchess of Gordon took a lively interest in this publication; and Mrs. Grant was, in this way, almost forced before the public. The poems were well received on their appearance in 1803; and though the Edinburgh reviewers, who spoke disparagingly of the poetic genius of Byron and of Grahame, would not allow much merit to her verses, (and they could scarcely allow less than she did herself,) they were constrained to admit that some of the pieces were "written with great beauty, tenderness, and delicacy."

"From the profits of this publication Mrs. Grant was enabled to discharge all the debts which had hitherto pressed upon her, and which had been contracted during her married life. But she was soon involved in another difficulty, which called her to England, arising from the dangerous illness of her eldest daughter, who, being threatened with a consumptive illness, had gone to Bristol for the benefit of her health. The recovery of this daughter was attended with great expense; and, soon after, Mrs. Grant had to provide for the outfit of one of her sons, who had got an appointment to India through the influence of her friend, Mr. Charles Grant, then chairman of the India House. To provide for these expenses, her friends suggested the propriety of publishing some of her letters. These letters had not been written with the slightest view to publication; and, accordingly, they contained many private allusions, and much harmless *badinage*, which, however attractive in the connexion in which they occurred, were quite unsuited for the public eye. It was thought, however, that even after suppressing all these passages, and thus mutilating the letters, they still contained so much artless description, and such graphic delineations of scenery and of character, as would be very interesting to the public. Mrs. Grant, who was always ready to defer to the opinions of her friends, consented, with some reluctance, to their publication; and this gave rise to the well known 'Letters from the Mountains,' which appeared in 1806. These Letters went through several editions, and

soon raised Mrs. Grant into much deserved popularity, and procured for her the patronage and friendship of many influential individuals, and particularly of the late Bishop Porteus, Sir Walter Farquhar, Sir William Grant, Master of the Rolls, and many other eminent persons.

"In the year 1810, Mrs. Grant removed from Stirling to Edinburgh, where she resided during the remainder of her life. Here it was her misfortune to lose successively all her remaining children, with the exception of her youngest son, who still survives. The submission with which she bowed to the will of Providence, under these heavy bereavements, excited the admiration of her sympathizing friends.

"The only other works of any magnitude, which Mrs. Grant prepared for the press, were her 'Memoirs of an American Lady,' already referred to, and her 'Essays on the Superstitions of the Highlanders of Scotland,' both of which have been favorably received. The former work has been greatly esteemed, both in this country and in America, and contains much vigorous and powerful writing, with sketches of transatlantic scenery and habits, during a primitive period, which the quarterly reviewers have characterized as 'a picture of colonial manners, just in their happiest age, given with a truth and feeling that cannot be too highly estimated.' Indeed, her description of the breaking up of the ice on the Hudson river is so admirable, the materials are so skilfully put together, and the impression made is so vivid, that Mr. Southey is reported to have pronounced the whole picture as 'quite Homeric.'

"But, perhaps, the most just and eloquent account which can be given of Mrs. Grant's writings is that which Sir Walter Scott appended to an application, which, under the superintendence of her friends, was made, in 1825, to his late Majesty, George the Fourth, for a pension to Mrs. Grant, and which bears the signature, not only of Sir Walter himself, but also of Lord Jeffrey, Mr. Mackenzie (the Man of Feeling), Sir William Arbuthnot, Sir Robert Liston, and Principal Baird, who all took a great interest in this application. In the document, now referred to, it is said, 'that the character and talents of Mrs. Grant have long rendered her, not only a useful and estimable member of society, but one eminent for the services which she has rendered to the cause of religion, morality, knowledge, and taste. Her literary works, although composed amidst misfortune and privation, are written at once with simplicity and force; and uniformly bear the stamp of a virtuous and courageous mind, recommending to the reader that patience and fortitude which the writer herself practised in such an eminent degree. Her writings, deservedly popular in her own country, derive their success from the happy manner in which, addressing themselves to the national pride of the Scottish people, they breathe a spirit, at once of patriotism, and of that candor which renders patriotism unselfish and liberal. We have no hesitation in attesting our belief that Mrs. Grant's writings have produced a strong and salutary effect upon her countrymen, who not only found recorded in them much of national history and antiquities, which would otherwise have been forgotten, but found them combined with the soundest and the best lessons of virtue and morality. We need scarcely add, that Mrs. Grant's character in private society has been equally high and exemplary; and it would be most painful to us to think that the declining

age of this excellent person, remarkable alike for her virtues and her talents, should, after such meritorious exertions to maintain her independence, and after so long a train of family misfortunes, have the bitterness of these privations aggravated by precarious and dependent circumstances.'

"It is gratifying to state that this application was completely successful, and that Mrs. Grant received a pension of one hundred pounds, yearly, on the Civil Establishment of Scotland, which, with the emoluments of her literary works, and some liberal bequests by deceased friends, which subsequently emerged, rendered her latter years quite easy and independent.

"Mrs. Grant's conversational powers were, perhaps, still more attractive than her writings. Her information on every subject, combined with her uniform cheerfulness and equanimity, made her society very delightful. There was a dignity and sedateness, united with considerable sprightliness and vivacity, in her conversation, which rendered it highly interesting; and, withal, it was so unaffected and natural, and seemed to emanate from her well stored mind with so little effort, that some of her profound and judicious remarks, as well as her liveliest sallies, appeared as if they had been struck off at the moment, without any previous reflection. The native simplicity of her mind, and an entire freedom from all attempt at display, soon made the youngest person, with whom she conversed, feel in the presence of a friend; and if there was any quality of her well balanced mind which stood out more prominently than another, it was that benevolence which made her invariably study the comfort of every person who came in contact with her.

"In reference to Mrs. Grant's conversational powers, it may be mentioned, that, in a series of Letters, published several years ago, a very competent judge, after observing that, of the '*blue stockings*, the French are the most tolerable, and the Scotch the most tormenting,' adds, that their favorite topics at Edinburgh then were, 'the resumption of Cash Payments, the great question of Burgh Reform, and the Corn Bill.' He goes on to say, that, at an evening party, 'I was introduced to Mrs. Grant of Laggan, the author of 'Letters from the Mountains,' and other well known works. Mrs. Grant is really a woman of great talents and acquirements, and might, without offence to any one, talk upon any subject she pleases. But, I assure you, any person who hopes to meet with a *blue stocking*, in the common sense of the term, in this lady, will feel sadly disappointed. She is as plain, modest, and unassuming, as she could have been, had she never stepped from the village whose name she has rendered so celebrated. Instead of entering on any long commonplace discussions, either about politics, or political economy, or any other of the hacknied subjects of tea-table talk in Edinburgh, Mrs. Grant had the good sense to perceive that a stranger, such as I was, came not to hear disquisitions, but to gather useful information; and she therefore directed her conversation entirely to the subject which she herself best understands — which, in all probability, she understands better than any one else — and which was precisely one of the subjects on which I felt the greatest inclination to hear a sensible person speak, namely, the Highlands. She related, in a very simple, but very graphic manner, a variety of little anecdotes

and traits of character, with my recollections of which I shall always have a pleasure in connecting my recollections of herself. The sound and rational enjoyment I derived from my conversation with this excellent person, would, indeed, atone for much more than all the *blue stocking* sisterhood have ever been able to inflict upon my patience.' — *Peter's Letters.* I. p. 308.

"Soon after this was written, and nearly twenty years ago, Mrs. Grant had the misfortune to meet with a severe fall, in descending a stair, in consequence of which she was ever after confined almost entirely to the house. This, it was feared, would have proved very injurious to the health of a person of her robust constitution and active habits; but, though she was generally confined to her chair, she still continued to enjoy excellent health, and her usual cheerfulness and equanimity. The great blandness and delicacy of her general manners, as well as her singular benevolence, and her patient and submissive endurance of those great sufferings, which arose from her various severe trials and afflictions, may be traced, in a considerable measure, to the influence of those religious habits which, it is believed, she sedulously cultivated, and which enabled her to repose the firmest confidence in her Heavenly Father, and in his wise and overruling providence. She was a firm believer in the doctrines of Christianity; and, while she spoke humbly of her reliance on the merits of the Savior, she gave reason to believe that she partook of the comforts and consolations which can be derived from no other source. Though she never made any display of her religious feelings, those who were in the habit of visiting her frequently found her engaged in the study of the holy Scriptures, which, indeed, her life and practice evinced she had not studied in vain.

"A few weeks ago Mrs. Grant caught a bad cold, which assumed the form of influenza, and her constitution gradually yielded to the influence of this debilitating malady. She died at Edinburgh, on the 7th of November, in the 84th year of her age; and her remains are interred in the new cemetery of the parish church of St. Cuthbert, in this neighborhood."

Obituary Notice. Died, at Chelmsford, Massachusetts, Nov. 18, 1838, the Rev. William Andrews, aged twenty-eight. We are permitted to insert an extract from the discourse of the Rev. Dr. Brazer, of Salem, delivered at his obsequies.

These remarks,* my friends of this Church and Society, will not be deemed inappropriate to the sad and solemn event which has this day called us together. We have great need, under circumstances like these, to revive and strengthen our religious confidence and trust. How sudden, how affecting are the vicisitudes of life! How startling the admonitions of Divine Providence! How little did we think, when less than three

---

* On the "Uses which should be made of the *Present Darkness of God's Providence.*"

years ago, we met you here, as ministers, to welcome our young brother to the sacred office, and to rejoice with you in the auspicious promises of that occasion, that we should so soon meet again, as we do here and now, to mingle our sympathies with yours, over the mortal remains of our brother. But God's will be done.

If I may be pardoned for a slight personal reference, I may well share in the sorrows of this hour, for I was intimately and peculiarly connected with my young brother, your minister, from his early years. He was born in the parish which is committed to my pastoral charge. He received the holy Rite of Baptism at my hands. He was committed to my especial care by the dying lips of his father. He united in our public religious services during the whole course of his childhood and youth. I observed with friendly interest his honorable career at our University. I watched over his faithful preparation for the preaching of the Gospel. I was taken to his counsel in reference to his settlement in the Ministry. I shared in those services which solemnized your union with him here. And now that these connexions are all broken off, and these happy prospects all darkened, I can well sympathize in your grief.

And yet your relations to our young brother were nearer and more intimate still. He was with you at your fire-sides. He continually sympathized in your welfare. He joined hands in holy bonds, when hearts had been before tenderly united. He was a Son of Consolation in your afflictions. He stood as a comforter by your beds of sickness. He offered your prayers in your sad bereavements. He led your devotions in this house of worship. He brought here the best products of his mind and heart, for your religious improvement, and administered to you here the tokens of a dying Savior's love. Well then may you mourn. Well may you mingle together your holiest sympathies, on an occasion like this. Well may you pour forth your tears over his bier. May God comfort you, my friends, with all the sufficing hopes of the Gospel of His Son.

But forget not, while you mourn, the alleviations with which even this sad trial is accompanied. His professional life, though short, was pure, honorable, useful, and continually improving. His message, though brief, was faithfully delivered. He has quickened, I doubt not, by the mild and gracious influences even of his short life and labors, those germs of piety that will be matured here, and bear fruit forever. Rejoice in the belief, that though his career was so suddenly cut off, he yet achieved for himself the highest and last attainment of the longest life, — a mature Christian character. His mind was free, discrimi-

nating, and continually improving upon itself. He loved the truth. He loved it for its own sake, and as God's great instrument of good to the undying soul; and he sought it with a single aim. His heart was tender, pure, affectionate, confiding. And though from a constitutional diffidence, he was not able to make a full display of all he felt and thought, yet few felt more acutely, or thought more maturely than he. He would, from these causes, have preferred a private and secluded sphere of action, but he considered it wrong to yield to this preference, and sacrificed on all occasions his private feelings, to what he deemed to be the claims of duty. This internal conflict was apparent in his public labors to those who knew him well, and gave a peculiar and touching effect to services which, in themselves, were always sensible, well-considered, appropriate, sincere, and deeply serious. In all the more private walks of life, he was a light, a comfort, a blessing. In the relation of a Son, a Brother, and a Friend, he has left nothing to be lamented, but that they were so suddenly broken off by his death. But I need not dwell longer on this theme. I know it would be useless to those whom I address. You knew him; you loved him; and you require no words like these, to remind you of what you have enjoyed, and, alas! that I must say so, — of what you have forever lost. "Lost" — did I say, — "forever lost!" No. He will not be thus lost to you. His memory will remain with you. His counsels will remain with you. What he has done and suffered for you will remain. His example will remain. All that was truly himself will remain with you, in tender, solemn, enduring recollection. And let it *so* remain, as he would have it remain, could he speak to you, not from the shrouded bier before us, but from that happier world, where, we trust, his pure spirit has gone. Let it *so* remain, that in all your future lives, you shall honor his memory, by being what he would have you to be.

I have but a few more words to add, and they are to press upon your attention the last he ever wrote. As I was preparing this necessarily hasty and very imperfect tribute to the memory of my friend this morning, in his accustomed place of study, I found a sermon just commenced upon the pensive remark of Job — "For we are of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow." These with one or two introductory sentences, were probably the last words he ever wrote. He was not, indeed, permitted to utter them; but associated as they thus are with his memory they should fall upon our hearts, with an emphasis, that no mere words can give. How affectingly are they enforced in the early and rapid ter-

mination of his own life! How solemnly has he illustrated in his own brief history, that our "days upon earth are indeed a shadow!" And may God in the goodness of His grace grant, that neither the all-concerning truth, nor the mournful illustration of it, be lost upon us.

Dr. Carpenter's Harmony of the Gospels. Second Edition. London. 8vo. pp. clxii. 307. — We announce with pleasure the arrival of a number of copies of the *second edition* of Dr. Carpenter's Harmony of the Gospels, which are now for sale at the Bookstore of James Munroe & Co. The review of the first edition of this work, which appeared in our Number for March, 1837, is kindly acknowledged by Dr. Carpenter in his preface, and alluded to elsewhere in the present edition. The Dedication to the Queen, which excited, on its appearance, such an outbreak of jealousy and spleen in certain quarters of the Establishment, is expressed in a strain of simple and respectful manliness. Some alterations and additions have been made in the work, but it remains substantially the same as before. To those who are interested in the study of the Scriptures, whether ministers, teachers of youth, or others, we unhesitatingly recommend it, as the most valuable book of its kind.

Woman as she should be. I. The Appropriate Sphere of Woman. II. The Influence of Christianity on Woman. III. The Christian Education of Woman. By Rev. Hubbard Winslow. Also, *Woman in her Social and Domestic Character.* By Mrs. John Sandford. From the Fifth London Edition. Boston: Otis, Broaders & Co. 1838. 12mo. pp. 81, — 175. — In whatever way or degree we might differ from Mr. Winslow on some points of theology, his views and doctrines with regard to the character, influence, place, and duties of woman, as set forth in this volume, meet with our hearty concurrence. We look on them as highly sound and orthodox. His thoughts on these subjects are judicious, practical, answering to the truth of things; and the style, in which they are expressed, is direct, simple, energetic. We cannot be at a loss to understand what he thinks of those females, who would push themselves and their sex forward into public meetings and affairs. He treats them with very little ceremony. And yet he would have females learn much, know much, and do much. What all this is, must be ascertained from his volume, in which it is made quite apparent that he entertains no reverence for a slothful woman.

The style of Mrs. Sanford's work is more graceful, more finished, more feminine, as it ought to be, than Mr. Winslow's; but her sentiments harmonize well with his, and the two treatises are fitly bound together. As we have already published a favorable notice of a former edition of her book, in our number for May, 1833, we shall only say now, that our opinion of its merit remains unchanged.

The Young Lady's Aid to Usefulness and Happiness. By Jason Whitman. Portland: S. H. Colesworthy. 1838. 12mo. pp. 216. — This volume is another faithful and sensible exposition of the appropriate duties of females. It was originally prepared in the form of lectures, addressed to the young ladies of the author's parish in Portland; which lectures now appear in the form of letters. These letters are six in number, and bear the following titles. I. The Influence of Christianity upon the Condition of Females. II. The Requirements of Christianity at the hand of females. III. Duty before Pleasure. IV. Intellectual Improvement. V. Intellectual Improvement. VI. Female Influence. On these topics Mr. Whitman has, as he says in his preface, "written straight on," using much plainness of speech, bautified by kindness of heart and gentleness of spirit. His work will not, any more than Mr. Winslow's, aid females in becoming generals, or senators, or officers of abolition societies; but, if it is read with candor, it will be true to its title, and prove their effectual Aid to Usefulness and Happiness.

EDITORIAL NOTICE.

The Editors of the Christian Examiner give notice that they resign their responsibility as such, with the publication of the present number. They take this occasion to thank those friends by whose contributions their task has been rendered light, and their subscribers and readers who have so constantly extended to them their approbation or indulgence. As they feel the liveliest interest in the success of the work which has for the last eight years been under their charge, it gives them sincere pleasure to be able to state that its editorship is transferred into the hands of the Rev. William Ware, a gentleman who needs no introduction to the religious and literary community, by whom he is already so well known and appreciated.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

N°. XCII.

THIRD SERIES — N°. XXIII.

MAY, 1839.

ART. I. — *Life of Joseph Brant, — Thayendanegea: including the Border Wars of the American Revolution, and Sketches of the Indian Campaigns of Generals Harmar, St. Clair, and Wayne, and other matters connected with the Indian relations of the United States and Great Britain, from the Peace of* 1783 *to the Indian Peace of* 1795. By WILLIAM L. STONE. New York: A. V. Blake & Co. 1838.

A CRITIC, disposed to be captious, might possibly suggest an amendment in the ample description of Mr. Stone's volumes cited above in the form of a title. He would surmise, even before reading them, that they might, with quite equal propriety, have been called a History including a Life, or a Life including a History. Nor can we predict that the force of this stricture would be abated after an examination of the contents of the work, so comparatively subordinate a share of his space has the author suffered his hero to occupy. During the whole of some chapters, and those not remarkable for laconicism, Brant never makes his appearance, even to be once named. Indeed, this arrangement is honestly avowed in the Introduction, where we are told that, in 1832, the design, "enlarged by reflection and research, now began to comprehend a history of the Six Nations, &c.; the settlement of the country by the pale faces; a history of the French War, so far as that memorable contest was connected with the Indians and colony of New York; — together, or rather blended with, the lives of Sir William John-

son and Joseph Brant." This plan appears to have been closely prosecuted, apparently making the Indian Chieftain (so far as this prospectus at least is concerned,) by no means sole monarch over the ground of the narrative, but rather a joint-possessor, with another personage who is ranked before him, of the biographical department allotted to the two, — a sort of Indian Reservation, — in a work which is mainly historical and general, instead of either personal or local, after all. Subsequently, in the Introduction, it is stated that the work embraces two epochs, implying respective divisions; the one "the early history referred to, with a history of the French War and the country to the death of Sir William Johnson," — at which period Brant barely makes his appearance; and the other "the Life of Brant, and the Revolutionary, Indian, and Tory wars of the northern and western part of the state of New York." And again, "It has been the object of the author to render it not only a local, but, to a certain extent, a brief general history of the war of the Revolution;" in other words, "*a particular history, ample in its details, of the belligerent events occurring at the west of Albany,*" with "*birds-eye glimpses of all the principal military operations of the whole contest.*" Such is the author's description of the work he entitles the Life of Brant.

But whatever may be said of the strict application of this title to such a composition, that question has nothing to do with the more important one which relates to the merits of the composition itself. Of these we believe but one general opinion has been, or can be, pronounced, — that it is one of the most valuable and the most interesting of the contributions ever made to American Annals. This is high praise, we know, but it is not unadvisedly uttered, as we may have some occasion to show. Neither is it bestowed irrespective of the faults of the work, or of what are sometimes considered to be such. We bear in mind, for example, the complaints which the reviewers generally have made of its miscellaneous and voluminous character, as above described. This criticism, however, does not seem to us very profound. It amounts to little more than a criticism on the wording of the title, (as we have hinted already,) not on the merits of the work. The complaint is not, that the Life of Brant is not, as we have called it, a valuable and an interesting book, but that it was not, and is not, truly described by the author; that it holds out what a lawyer would

call "false pretences," though we by no means intend to intimate furthermore, in like style, that he was instigated thereto by any malice aforethought or felonious intent. The plea is one in amendment, not in abatement of the writ. No one objects to the History of the Border Wars of and before the Revolution; no one to the running accompaniment to the Life in question of these "bird's-eye glimpses" over the field of the general contest. The latter, in our opinion, was mainly indispensable. The former, on the other hand, is subservient in so remarkable a degree to the complete appreciation and lively enjoyment of the biographical portion of the work, that no liberal reader, we think, would be willing either to lose the benefit and interest of it altogether, or to be compelled to resort to a separate composition for what is now so important a part of this.

Such, at least, must be the general impression. It is not pretended that the author has perfectly succeeded in the execution of this design. It would be extraordinary, indeed, if, with so vast a mass of material as he has brought together and wrought over in this scheme, — so heterogeneous — much of it so original, — he should leave no room for just strictures on the admission or the arrangement of his details. Obvious improvements in these respects doubtless remain to be made; *so* obvious that the author would hardly thank us for pointing them out. None of them, however, appear to us very important, after all. Perhaps the greatest error has been the introduction of too great a quantity of old Indian speeches, without so severe a regard to their intrinsic interest or correlative value as might have been desired. The dullest of them, we are aware, have their worth in the historian's and the philosopher's estimation. If the work of Mr. Stone had professedly been written for such readers alone, or chiefly, the criticism in question would probably never have been made. The error, in fact, would not have existed. It is, in other words, an error merely in reference to the success, the popularity, of the book. The great majority of its readers, we apprehend, will turn over the leaves comprising these speeches, as they would those comprising a multitude of more modern, and perhaps more civilized ones, which we wot of; whereas, there is no doubt, Mr. Stone, like the orators referred to, intended that the speeches should be read, — nay, admired, for aught we know, — exalted above all Greek, all Roman fame. The author is enthusiastic on this

head. Referring, for instance, in a note, to the great Indian Council held in 1793 at the foot of the Miami Rapids, he cries out, "What a pity that, at such a congress, *a bench of stenographers could not have been present!* What bursts of thrilling eloquence, — the unsophisticated language of nature, gathering its metaphors, fresh and glowing, from her own rich store-house, the flowers, the forests, and the floods, the sun, the stars, and the blue sky, the winds, the earthquake, and the storms, — must there have been poured forth but to die away upon the earth that heard them!"

Now, we are not wholly insensible to the philosophy of this observation, somewhat glowingly expressed as it is. We should like ourselves to have heard Brant and the Cornplanter on this very occasion. It is probable they must have said something worth remembering, in a manner worth seeing. Something of that sort is likely to occur in most great conventions of men, of whatever generic character or individual ability. Among the Indian tribes have been many such occasions, as among ourselves. We cannot think, however, that history or posterity has so strong an interest in employing a band of stenographers wherever they occur, especially if the consequence should be the publication or preservation of all the minutiæ of the scene or the "talk," or of any considerable portion of it. Very much the larger part of this talk is, to speak plainly, and following the most unprejudiced authorities, intolerably stupid and tedious; as unimportant to the public or to posterity in all cases, as the ordinary daily speechifying of *caucuses* among the whites; and very much more so in many. Such men as Cornplanter, or Brant, or Cornstalk, or Logan, or Red Jacket, may, now and then, say something characteristic, curious, or even striking, on such an occasion; but the peculiarity, perhaps the merit, of this consists, we should say, in its utter simplicity, its perfect literal plainness, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred; and as for the others, the great majority of speakers, the Messrs. "*Cat's Eyes*," and "*Carry-one-about*," we should as soon think of employing a band of stenographers to preserve all that is uttered at any New England town-meeting, on the first Monday in March, as to report *their* lucubrations. It is far better, we take it, to lose the rare good things which do occur under these circumstances, than to undergo the whole, or any great part of it, or even to be put to the trouble, — which is much the same thing, — of having to ransack the whole mass of inanity and

jargon in search of the grain or two in question which *may* be worthy of notice.

Nor is there much lost in kind, any more than in quantity. As we said before, genuine Indian eloquence, their only eloquence which deserves attention as such, is essentially of one style, and that easily imagined, readily ascertained, indeed, from the specimens which have been preserved. There are some of these specimens as such, of a remarkable character, in the volumes before us; in their way most admirable compositions. But these, we think, and others of like kind, which are elsewhere to be found, are sufficient for the purposes they subserve. We are content to leave the rest to imagination, or to estimate, as we can so safely, the unknown by the specimens we have. Such, for aught we know, was our author's design in preserving so many of these long, rigmarole speeches, as well as so many that are worth preserving. Nothing was more natural than that his enthusiasm should deceive him for the moment. One of the chief characteristics of his work, in our eyes almost its first merit, and that a very rare and high one, is his *partiality*, we were going to say, for the Indians; his *im*partiality, however, we mean; but the course of history and of literature at large, the tone of public sentiment too generally among us, has been so perverse on this subject so long, that strict justice itself to the Indians has come to be regarded not only as a virtue, but as something more, — a generosity, a grace; — or, on the other hand, perhaps, an evidence of a somewhat romantic sensibility, — an amiable weakness, — a feeling more to be watched and warned against, however, than trusted in, far less admired. Now we know of no American historian who has shown more of this weakness than Mr. Stone, — the determination, cost what it might, to give the Indians fair play. This weakness may be called, without much of a blunder, his *forte*. It has given him strength, at all events, to achieve a mighty reform in our Indian annals, — an Herculean purgation, unrivalled since the days of the Augean stable. Other writers have discovered a just feeling on the subject, especially within a few years; and these writers, Irving and Bancroft for example, have said and done something, not a little, to purify public opinion in regard to it. For this they deserve praise. Mr. Stone, on the same principle, deserves much more. He has taken hold of this work, not incidentally, nor sentimentally. He has not contented himself with a general expression, or even exertion, on behalf of the

red men, any more than with merely abstaining from abusing them, as others have done before. To do them absolute, accurate, ample justice, this was his aim. This was, more than anything else, the *gist* of the whole of his laborious enterprise. In the prosecution of it nothing has discouraged him. The labor, to say nothing of the odium, was prodigious; but his spirit is unflinching to the last. What wonder, if, under these circumstances, in the course of the discoveries the plan led to, and of the reflections they occasioned, a little more than just enough of the true historical ardor, which alone could impel any man through such an enterprise, should have been sometimes excited, — if the enthusiasm, which is not only so amiable and noble a quality in the historian in itself, but lies at the foundation of so many other of his merits, should, "much enforced, show a hasty spark" of needless flame. The cold-blooded writer, who, in the midst of the most exciting considerations, can so command himself as to defy all criticism, must be hardly worth criticising, hardly worth reading at all. The historian should not rush upon his subject, certainly, like a Quixote; but, on the other hand, he must feel, no less than think, and he must feel deeply that he *may* think, and that he may do all that his hands find to do, and do it with a spirit which only such feeling can give; — and how are we to have the face to demand of such a writer that every arrangement, every word, shall conform to the *popular* standard, or even to the *proper* one, — to everybody's taste and mood, or to those of the perfectly disinterested (that is, *un*interested) observer? The "faultless" historian, in such a case, would be indeed a "monster." We cannot say that the world may never produce such a one; but certainly it never has.

We make no great account, then, of this criticism on the Indian speeches. Some of them are unsurpassed, almost unequalled, by anything of the kind which has yet appeared. The rest, which are not so good, nevertheless have a comparative value, at least in the eyes of readers of a certain taste. The rest of us can easily, as we said before, turn over a few leaves at once, and escape the calamity of having to read them. We apprehend that the author himself will presently become one of these. By the time that three *more* editions of his work have been taken up, he will have acquired that coolness of judgment which is quite as necessary to good revision, as his own ardor is to glowing and graphic composition. Horace

would have had him wait for this state of mind much longer than we should be willing to have him. "Nine years" might do for a poem. For some histories it would, but not for one like this. Taken up so late as it has been, were there no other reason for something like a business energy in the publication, as well as the execution of the work, it would be found in the peculiar character of a large part of its material. Much of this, under the circumstances, may be said to want *seasoning;* but that is a process it can only undergo to advantage *in the open air.* So much of these volumes as may be called oral, traditional, conjectural, experimental in a word, must be proved. We must see how it bears examination — such examination as the public may see fit to superadd to the author's. Of this original matter, as we have intimated, there is a vast deal; few American historians, if any, have looked up as much, or as interesting. Now let it pass through the furnace of criticism, — the sooner the better. In respect to a great part of it, those, who alone are competent to criticise, are fast passing away, — the Revolutionary generation. These, too, are the authorities to be looked to for timely additions. Contributions of this kind, for his future editions, the author cannot but receive, as it is. We take the liberty, in our imagination, to regard a writer of Mr. Stone's well known enthusiasm, industry, and experience, putting forth a book of this kind, as a species of literary long-tongued ant-eater, eagerly watching for all sorts of reminiscences, making a luscious meal of them now and then, and always standing ready for any quantity more. Our historian, to do him justice, is almost at the head of these fact-gatherers, for energy and variety of collection, though we do not mean to charge him, by any means, with an indiscriminate appetite for everything of this nature that comes in his way. It is easy to see that he had, in these volumes, a huge work of selection and rejection to do. The wonder is, how even *he* has managed to call forth so clear, so connected, and so condensed a system of narrative as this is, out of a chaos like that in which he commenced his labors.

Let us render him something like justice in this matter. Pains-taking and patience are prime qualities in a historian. In an American historian they are especially needed, for ours is much of it new ground, — as it were historical *forest.* He who explores it must hew his own path-way, and encounter no small hardship at the best. And yet, must this work be done

by somebody — just as it was and is necessary that the literal wilderness, which covers a great portion of the face of the country, should be cleared away for the advancement of civilization. We look upon men like Mr. Stone as Boones or Putnams, first settlers and surveyors of the wild land of literature. The spirit, which makes men pioneers in the one case as in the other, is a spirit to which America owes a vast debt, and must owe a greater one still. When that enterprise and energy are combined with perseverance, science, system, and good sense, it is better yet. These are the men who "constitute a State," and who are daily creating States upon this continent, as they have been creating them for two hundred years. We want authors of a corresponding hardihood, for there is still heavier drudgery for *them* to do. Witness, in illustration, this case of Brant. Speaking of the latter portion of his work, our author says so. Most of our readers, we dare say, would suppose the same. But it proved otherwise. He had to visit Canada for materials, to begin with. Fortunately he learned the existence there of a great mass of manuscripts, left by the Chieftain, including an extensive correspondence. These were finally obtained from Brant's youngest daughter, Mrs. Kerr, of Wellington Square, U. C. (a full-blooded Indian lady, of high respectability and finished education). This acquisition, however, was but a first step. These papers were nearly all connected with Brant's career subsequent to the war, and when the author came to examine them, he found — but let us hear what he says:

"That his life and actions had been intimately associated with the Indian and Canadian politics of more than twenty years after the treaty of peace; that a succession of Indian Congresses were held by the nations of the great lakes, in all which he was one of the master spirits; that he was directly or indirectly engaged in the wars between the United States and Indians from 1789 to 1795, during which the bloody campaigns of Harmar, St. Clair, and Wayne took place; and that he acted an important part in the affair of the North-Western posts, so long retained by Great Britain after the treaty of peace. This discovery compelled the writer to enter upon a new and altogether unexpected field of research. Many difficulties were encountered in the composition of this branch of the work, arising from various causes and circumstances. The conflicting relations of the United States, the Indians, and the Canadians, together with the peculiar and sometimes apparently equivocal position in which the Mohawk

chief — the subject of the biography — stood in regard to them all; the more than diplomatic caution with which the British officers managed the double game which it suited their policy to play so long; the broken character of the written materials obtained by the author; and the necessity of supplying many links in the chain of events from circumstantial evidence and the unwritten records of Indian diplomacy, all combined to render the matters to be elucidated exceedingly complicated, intricate, and difficult of clear explanation." — *Introduction*, pp. xxiv, xxv.

This is what we call drudgery. It is a drudgery peculiar to history-making in this country, and such as this; — very similar, as we said before, to the drudgery of *making* the country itself. He, who reads this Introduction through, will better appreciate both our own meaning and our author's merit. If we mistake not, he will feel a little as if he were reading the Journal of Arnold's Canadian Expedition, or Washington's Virginian Surveys, or ante-Revolutionary martial forays into the wilderness of the Ohio. Our author, like those worthies, had to carry all his supplies with him, in the rude, inclement region he traversed, — or to hunt them down on his way. He had his own road to make, a road in some places where there was no soil, or where it was nearly impossible to get at what there was. All manner of aids must be levied upon all sorts of people, with a view to these necessities. The Johnson papers, to take a literal instance, were to be looked up; and, accordingly,

"A valuable manuscript volume has been procured, containing the private diary of Sir William during the Niagara campaign of 1759, in which General Prideaux fell, leaving the command of the army to the baronet." — p. xxi.

And then, in another quarter, was found

"The manuscript of Sir William's official diary for the years 1757, 1758, and a part of the year 1759, together with a small parcel of other papers and letters. A few of the baronet's letters and papers are also yet extant, in the archives of the state at Albany." — p. xxi.

This is well, and fortunate, so far; but it implies no end to the labor. Some documents are presumed to have been destroyed; but these, or others unknown, *may* be extant — somewhere. The author supposes a special visit must be made to

England, in search of them. We can testify, ourselves, to tolerably diligent researches, prosecuted with this view, among the dusty archives of some of the official departments in London; labors which those not accustomed to undergo them might have deemed but poorly rewarded, — the discovery, perhaps, of an old letter or two, between the Parent administration and the Provincial authorities, bearing more or less directly or distinctly on some not well-settled point.

Such is the American historian's work, if he does his duty. Such was Mr. Stone's. That it was or is mere drudgery altogether, we should not say; still less, if it were so, that there was no comfort to be taken in it, or reward to be had for it. *Ipse labor voluptas* is in no sphere of activity more applicable than in this. Of course it is understood that our historian, like the explorers of the wilderness to whom we compared him, is a *volunteer;* that he enters upon his business more as an adventure than a task; that to his vigorous and curious instincts there is something stimulating in its untrampled solitudes, its "green savannahs all bright and still," its novelty, its rudeness itself; and the more hazard and the more hardship to such a spirit, the better. Boone never pined for the civilization which he left behind him. He fled farther and farther away, when it approached him. He revelled in the gratification of a thirst for a certain excitement which belonged to his nature, a gratification which society denied him, but which nature herself supplied. The volunteer, instinctive, constitutional historian has the same satisfaction in his labors; and besides, though we fear there is not much to be said just now to advantage, in this connection, about pecuniary profit, — for our consolation, the lowest and poorest of all motives to a literary enterprise, — there is no reason, that we know of, why he, who acquits himself faithfully in this department, should be discouraged from expecting at least the full recompense which consists in a just popularity and a permanent and honorable fame. Perhaps among ourselves this remark applies to historical labors with peculiar force. The taste of our community in literature, as in everything else, is of a practical kind. The more matter of fact, the better for them; the better, of course, in one way or another, for him who supplies and gratifies the taste. We know no more enviable reputations in American literature than three of our fellow-citizens have lately acquired, or begun to acquire, in works of the description referred to. We know

of no community, neither, which has better enforced its theory of appreciation by its actual treatment of most of these works, as well as of many others. The London Courier was pleased, not long ago, to bewail the barbarism of a country where a book like Mr. Prescott's *History of Ferdinand and Isabella* could be produced without being read; but the justice of that sneer has been but ill proved by the second and third editions which that admirable composition has already gone to, voluminous and expensive as it is, and to say nothing of the comparatively distant interest of its site and subject. We have intimated that Mr. Stone's work itself, which is still more recent, has met with an equal success. The successive supplies disappearing from the booksellers' counters, it would seem more as if they were fashionable, flimsy novels than weighty and dignified volumes like these. All this is highly encouraging. The production and the circulation among us of a few standard historical works which we might name, and among which we rank the Life of Brant, are subjects of cordial congratulation for all of us who feel an interest in our country's true welfare and honor. Such signs, we hope, will stimulate new "volunteers" to come forward, as well as encourage the first "settlers" to proceed still farther, and achieve yet more. Most of us are a business-driving, money-making, all-excited generation, as our fathers have been, in one way or another, before us. Hence we have done a great deal, but for the same reason we have said little about it; no nation ever did more or said less. We have been too much engrossed in making the materials of history, to think of making history itself. This was a natural spirit, under the circumstances; it is so still; great results have come from it, of their kind; great credit is due to it. It may, however, be carried too far; no doubt it has been. We have neglected our historical opportunities and necessities, and are neglecting them, too much. Vast quantities of rich data have been, and are, and will be, overlooked and destroyed. Let us hope that a goodly company of such as our author may be found, to stay this process in some decent degree. Let the community, so deeply interested in their labors, more and more endeavor to rouse them to the consolatory conviction of the Roman annalist, that, as it is noble and glorious to serve one's country, so it is no trivial thing — *haud absurdum* — to record the conduct of those who have done so before us. The fighting duty, at least, of this community has, we trust, been chiefly

performed; the writing service largely remains to do. The age of the historian here, as in Rome, has succeeded the age of the hero.

We were speaking of the description of drudgery incidental to a work like Mr. Stone's; and this, we said, was not wholly unredeemed, to a mind like his, by the excitement of curiosity, adventure, discovery, and labor itself. It must be borne in mind, as an important encouragement to the pioneer historians of our country, additional to any yet alluded to, that the labor in question may always be sure of a good degree of professional success. In other countries, in most old ones of course, the material of history has been comparatively used up long since; or, at all events, preceding generations have had the handling of it to such an extent that the remains can be regarded only in the light of what the lumbermen call "*refuse stuff.*" Occasionally some indefatigable antiquary, as in England, comes out, after researches which it wearies one to think of, with a few new documents of the date of Elizabeth's reign; or the original manuscript of some rather notorious work is discovered. This is well enough, so far as it goes. It is well that all the "fragments be gathered up, that nothing be lost." One of these days it will be so here. We shall exult, in like manner, over every new letter of Washington's or Franklin's, every old pensioner's journal of the French or the Revolutionary War, which shall be dragged forth from the oblivious obscurity of the antique candle-boxes and clock-cases, where they now have the honor to repose. But at present, and for a long time to come, our collectors will have it all their own way. They are traversing, as first explorers, a complete El Dorado of a region, whose soil everywhere breaks out with shining ores, and where, if labor is still indispensable, — if they must "climb the steep," — they feel that they toil the while, or may be toiling, over veins of gold and beds of jewels; and that even the next shrub, which they cling to on the crag-side, may prove like that by which the Peruvian was astonished, when the wealth of the mines of Potosi rolled out from its roots before him. This country is richer even than any other ever was in historical material. Vast as the amount of it doubtless is which has gone already to destruction and decay, the masses which remain are still more vast. The whole face of the soil is covered with them. The adventurer cannot go amiss in his search. He needs no divining-rod, no alchemy, no magic spell. The old houses of

any State in New England, to say the least, — of any county or even township in Massachusetts, we might add, — will supply him with his heart's content of employment and excitement for years. Our generation, as we said before, is too busy, too practical, to pore over these things as they deserve; but no matter; they will grow, like the Sybil's leaves, more and more precious year by year, as some portions will gradually disappear altogether, and others become more dim and difficult to interpret or decypher; and then, at length, the true time of the American antiquary will have come.

Meanwhile, however, let us rejoice and be thankful that a few such spirits as our author's are having their reward. If they must undergo drudgery, as we called it, it is no barren industry; no dull, mercenary, hopeless labor, wasted on a soil which others have already explored and exhausted, and where a scanty subsistence is the most which enthusiasm itself can look for. Let us take a case or two in point, from this Introduction. Three times, the author says, he visited the Mohawk Valley, in search of material. Now see the result:

"Ascertaining, moreover, that the venerable Major Thomas Sammons, of Johnstown, himself, with his father and two brothers, an efficient actor in the scenes of the Revolution, had for many years been collecting historical materials in that region, the author applied to him; and was so fortunate as not only to procure his collections, but to induce the old gentleman to reënter the field of inquiry. By his assistance a large body of facts and statements, taken down in writing during the last thirty years, from the lips of surviving officers and soldiers, has been obtained for the present work. These documents have added largely to the most authentic materials of history, enabling the author to bring out many new and interesting facts, and to correct divers errors in the works of preceding writers, who have superficially occupied the same ground. In addition to these, the few remaining papers of the brave old General Herkimer, who fell at Oriskany, in 1777, have been placed at the disposal of the author, by his grandson, John Herkimer, Esq." — pp. xxi, xxii.

Then followed the Canadian discoveries mentioned above. Then access was obtained to the private papers of General Clinton, the father of Governor De Witt Clinton, and brother of Governor George Clinton. The General commanded often in the Northern Department. He conducted the celebrated

Descent of the Susquehannah, in 1779. As might be expected,

"His own letters, and those of his correspondents, have been of material assistance, not only in relation to that campaign, but upon various other points of history. It was among these papers that the letters of Walter N. Butler, respecting the affairs of Cherry Valley and Wyoming, were discovered." — pp. xxii, xxiii.

And this leads to something more:

"In connexion with the history of the expedition of Sullivan and Clinton, just referred to, the author has likewise been favored with the manuscript diary of the venerable Captain Theodosius Fowler of this city, who was an active officer during the whole campaign. In addition to the valuable memoranda contained in this diary, Capt. Fowler has preserved a drawing of the order of march adopted in ascending the Chemung, after the junction of the two armies, and also a plan of the great battle fought at Newtown by Sullivan, against the Indians and Tories commanded by Brant and Sir John Johnson." — p. xxiii.

Sometimes a temporary or partial disappointment was experienced, but the true historical perseverance prevails:

"In the winter of 1775 – '76, an expedition was conducted from Albany into Tryon County, for the purpose of disarming the Tories and arresting Sir John Johnson, of the particulars of which very little has hitherto been known. On application to the family of General Schuyler, it was ascertained that his letter books for that period were lost. After much inquiry, the necessary documents were obtained from Peter Force, Esq., at Washington." — p. xxiii.

No contribution, however apparently trifling, is neglected by such a collector as Mr. Stone. He looks up, one after another, all the surviving acquaintances of his hero, Brant. One of these is General Porter, who corresponded with him, and knew him well. Another is a Connecticut octogenarian, who

"Made a visit to Brant at the Grand River Settlement, in the summer of 1797, and remained with him several days, in the enjoyment of frequent and full conversations upon many subjects." — p. xxiii.

Professor Marsh, of Burlington College, a relative of the

Wheelock family, (who had much to do with the Brants,) furnishes several original letters; and a New York gentleman, the same. We enumerate these successes with great satisfaction, not as being extraordinary or wonderful in themselves, (though enough so to do the author great credit,) but rather the reverse of that, — as fair illustrations of the remarks made above, on the abundance and value of our unexplored historical material in this country; as specimens of the results which a similar enterprise, perseverance, and enthusiasm may generally be expected to attain. The following instance, which we find in the second volume, is more anomalous. We can hardly look, all of us, for discoveries like this. The author is speaking of the Battle of Durlagh, in Western New York, under date of 1781:

"There was one very painful circumstance attending this battle. In their excursion to Currietown, the day before, Doxstader and his Indians had made nine prisoners, among whom were Jacob and Frederick Diefendorff, Jacob Myers and a son, a black boy, and four others. The moment the battle commenced, the prisoners, who were bound to standing trees for security, were tomahawked and scalped by their captors, and left as dead. The bodies of these unfortunate men were buried by Colonel Willett's troops. Fortunately, however, the graves were superficial, and the covering slight — a circumstance which enabled Jacob Diefendorff, who, though stunned and apparently dead, was yet alive, to disentomb himself. A detachment of militia, under Colonel Veeder, having repaired to the field of action after Willett had returned to Fort Rennselaer, discovered the supposed deceased on the outside of his own grave; and he has lived to furnish the author of the present work with an account of his own burial and resurrection." — p. 159.

Such are the labors, and such the rewards, of American historical research. There is one variety of the former, not yet alluded to distinctly, but of which something should be said, if we mean to do justice to works like this before us. No small part of the task of Mr. Stone has consisted, not in positive additions to history by the discovery and digging out of materials unknown or unnoticed before, but in doing away with long established abuses which stood in the way of both old truth and new, and of all sorts of justice besides. To resume our favorite figure, the nature of his expedition obliged him to clear up the face of the country he traversed, — a country which was a

mere wilderness, so far as his purpose was concerned, — to hew down the forest and smooth over the surface, before the real business of great exploration could commence.

This is particularly true in the Indian department of American history, which of all "wild land" is the wildest, — a complete Seminole swamp-land, bottomless, shadowy, streaked over with flitting *ignes fatui* confusions, echoing with dismal cries of savages and brutes. A great multitude of these latter have fallen before our author's prowess, who put himself manfully, like Hercules again, to the almost desperate, but quite indispensable, "labor" of making a safe, comfortable highway for all travellers through the country in question. The unkindest cut of all, in this sorry business at the best, was doubtless to encounter so many of his own race, his own countrymen, in the way, — armed, too; in arms against himself and all new comers; squatters, claiming possession and property, it might be, — possibly mere pirates, rendering no reasons for anything, and living by plundering the Indians themselves. We count Mr. Weld, the traveller, for one of the worthies in this category; and those of our readers, who refer to his monstrous accounts of the American natives, cited in these volumes, will certainly justify us for so doing. We mention him, however, merely as one of a class, a large one. He was no worse than many more, who might be named, of much greater authority. We should, by no means, charge him unadvisedly with any special malice in putting these disgusting libels on record which we refer to; he did but retail out to his English readers what American authorities, written or otherwise, could always supply him with in any quantities. American literature, still more than English of course, — American history in particular, as might be expected, — is thoroughly infected with prejudices and falsehoods similar to those selected and warmed up afresh by such men as Weld.

The circumstances, which have led to this state of things, are of great variety and long standing. Most of our historians, as Mr. Stone remarks,

> "English and American, wrote too near the time when the events they were describing occurred, for a dispassionate investigation of truth; and other writers, who have succeeded, have too often been content to follow in the beaten track, without incurring the labor of diligent and calm inquiry." — p. xvi.

"The crude, verbal reports of the day — tales of hear-say, colored by fancy and aggravated by fear, — not only found their way into the newspapers, but into the journals of military officers. These, with all the disadvantages incident to flying rumors, increasing in size and enormity with every repetition, were used too often, it is apprehended, without farther examination, as authentic materials for history." — pp. xvi, xvii.

Many cases of this kind are referred to, in which historical authorities, otherwise highly respectable, are involved. We are reminded that even

"The diligent care of Marshall did not prevent his measurably falling into the same errors, in the first edition of his Life of Washington, with regard to Wyoming; and it was not until more than a quarter of a century afterward, when his late revised edition of that great work was about to appear, that, by the assistance of Mr. Charles Miner, an intelligent resident of Wilkesbarre, the readers of that eminent historian were correctly informed touching the revolutionary tragedy in that valley. Nor even then was the correction entire, inasmuch as the name of Brant was still retained as the leader of the Indians on that fearful occasion." — p. xvii.

One of the special tasks of Mr. Stone, we hardly need say, has been to clear up this Wyoming affair. So far as Brant was concerned, he had this to do for the first time. In all historical works, up to the publication of this Life, that chieftain has had credit for conducting all the infamous atrocities of that memorable occasion. This, of course, was sufficient to brand his name with universal disgrace. Campbell has him recorded to this day, in his "Gertrude," as the "monster Brant;" and "accursed" is another term, if we rightly remember, which that amiable writer considers none too bad to apply to him. When Brant's son was in England a few years since, he explained the whole matter to the poet's satisfaction. The reply of the latter to that effect is inserted in this work. In that communication, he promised to correct the error in a future edition; and we regret, with Mr. Stone, that this tardy justice has yet been rendered only so far as a reference to the subject in a note, without a corresponding alteration of the text, could effect it. This is a striking instance in point, to show how extensive are the effects of the original sin in such matters; how difficult to eradicate the poison when once set in motion. Innumerable other

cases of the kind might be mentioned. Our author has had his hands full of such, having the Indian district of American history so largely to explore. Here, again, he deserves especial credit for his labors. No prejudice, no ignorance, no authority, no confusion of statements, has discouraged him from working his way through to the truth at last. We know of no historian who has done as much in the way of disabusing the public of old falsehoods and mistakes. His corrections, if possible, still more than his contributions, entitle him to the lasting gratitude of his countrymen. For ourselves, we forgive him the whole of his Indian Speeches.

So much for early prejudice, the natural effect of the kind of intercourse which, unhappily, occurred too generally between the red race and the white. It will be moreover remembered, that the influence of this feeling has never been counteracted by contemporaneous authority, in any considerable degree. In the case of most differences between great parties like these, — as between political factions, or contending communities, — there are sure to be two sets of prejudices, exaggerations, and fabrications, the one of which does tolerably well as an off-set against the other, so that, putting both together, and weighing well, at the same time, the strictures with which everything advanced by one party is sure to be met by the other, an observer or reader, who is really disposed to get at the truth, may be able to do so, in due course of time. Take the obsolete disputes, for example, between the various political combinations which have appeared and disappeared in the United States, since the adoption of the Constitution. Take, for another, the conflicting and confused accounts of the Revolutionary contest, or even of the last war, between ourselves and Great Britain. Here there are two sides to the question, and full justice, and perhaps a great deal more, is done to both. The result is that any body, American or English, who really wants to understand the merits of these cases, is enabled to do so. The Indian has no such privilege allowed him, and never had. There are no two sides to his question; there never were. If he can be called a party to any history, it is only as a criminal, suspected, accused, and put upon a mock trial, where no opportunity of defence, no argument, no jury, is allowed him; where, in fact, he is summoned into court merely to be sentenced to be "hanged by the neck till he is dead." This circumstance, of course, has greatly aggravated the evil effected by the prejudice

of which we have spoken, for it has always told its story all in its own way. Nobody ever wept for Logan, — nobody spoke for him, "not one." Brant, but for our author, might have continued forever the accursed monster which Campbell found him portrayed by all the authorities.

And so with the race at large. No statement about them, no comment upon them, has been at certain times, at most periods, too gross to be eagerly believed; and though the *most* gross of these have, in the progress of years, become too monstrous for any market, — being left high and dry, in all their hideousness, when the deluge of hatred that first set them afloat had subsided in some degree, — still vast multitudes of them remain just as they were, and the general, secret, long-drawn effects of *all* of them, uncontradicted, uncounteracted, from age to age. A few of their customs, for instance, — chiefly in war, which is always cruel, — have been taken as conclusive proofs of a constitution unnaturally blood-thirsty and void of all human feeling.

"Forgetting," as Mr. Stone says, "that the second of the Hebrew monarchs did not scruple to saw his prisoners with saws, and harrow them with harrows of iron; forgetful, likewise, of the scenes at Smithfield, under the direction of our own British ancestors; the historians of the poor untutored Indians, almost with one accord, have denounced them as monsters *sui generis* — of unparalleled and unapproachable barbarity; as though the summary tomahawk were worse than the iron tortures of the harrow, and the torch of the Mohawk hotter than the fagots of Queen Mary." — pp. xiii, xiv.

And so we have forgotten that the Indians have their systems of education, of martial training, among the rest; that these barbarities were *not* such in their estimation; that they exercised these customary cruelties in the vindication and defence of all that is dear to man. And most of all, we forget, we do not know, we never can know, the examples which were set before them, and the terrible provocations they endured.

"It would require the aggregate of a large number of predatory incursions and isolated burnings, to balance the awful scene of conflagration and blood, which at once extinguished the power of Sassacus, and the brave and indomitable Narragansets over whom he reigned. No! until it is forgotten, that by some Christians in infant Massachusetts it was held to be right to kill Indians

as the agents and familiars of Azazel; until the early records of even tolerant Connecticut, which disclose the fact that the Indians were seized by the Puritans, transported to the British West Indies, and sold as slaves, are lost; until the Amazon and La Plata shall have washed away the bloody history of the Spanish American conquest; and until the fact that Cortez stretched the unhappy Guatimozin naked upon a bed of burning coals, is proved to be a fiction, let not the American Indian be pronounced the most cruel of men!" — p. xv.

And this is, of course, but the fairest possible glimpse at the Indian side of the question. The greater part of their argument, as we said before, is already lost beyond recovery. The most we can do is to form, from what little we do happen to have found out, some dim, conjectural calculation of the great system of wrongs they have been continually suffering at every point, in the way of evil communications, as well as of more palpable outrages of every conceivable description.

"The little we have happened to ascertain," we said; little in comparison with what must be still unknown, and destined forever to remain so; but yet how vast an aggregate of abuses might be made up by him who should choose to consult even the one-sided history of the two races which alone exists, with such a view! These volumes of Mr. Stone are full of such disclosures, — disclosures not so much intentionally as incidentally made, — and so frequent as at last to excite neither remark nor surprise. To begin at a late date, nobody needs to be reminded of the causes which brought on *Cresap's War*, with all its more than Indian barbarities at the time, and all the unwritten, but indelible, evil consequences which flowed from it. The sufferings of Logan on this occasion have made some impression on the public mind, for Logan was an orator, and for once an Indian opened his lips to the white man on the great subject which has lain rankling at the hearts of the race for so many ages. Three years afterwards, that noble-hearted old chieftain, *Cornstalk*, the Shawanee, once the bravest enemy, but then the best friend, of the white men, — the King of the Northern Confederacy in 1774, but in 1777 a volunteer mediator, at great hazard, for the maintenance of peace, when all around him cried out again for war, — this man, having undertaken a long journey through the wilderness, with these views, to the American fortress on Point Pleasant, attended by only a young

Delaware chief, *Redhawk*, who had also fought at his side in the Cresap war, was basely murdered in cold blood, within the walls. The old man had told his story. He frankly stated that he could no longer keep his tribe at peace. The American officer deemed it prudent to detain him as a hostage for their *good behavior*. He submitted quietly to this; but meanwhile, *Ellinipsico*, his son, a man of his own spirit, became uneasy about him, and came in to the fort, where an affectionate interview occurred. The *next* day, two white men, on a hunting excursion, were fired on by Indians, — it was said, — nobody knows whom. The provocation is not stated. Perhaps there was no other but this very treatment of the chiefs at the fortress, which, indeed, some civilized nations would probably have considered quite a sufficient ground of reprisals. Perhaps, on the other hand, it was done in revenge of some other and older provocation, (if not of one given on the spot,) of which nothing had ever been heard, or ever will; at the worst, it was a murder committed by individuals who alone were responsible for the crime. The white men near the fortress heard of it, however, and a scene of Lynch Law commenced:

"A party of ruffians assembled, under the command of a Captain Hall, —not to pursue and punish the perpetrators of the murder, — but to fall upon the friendly and peaceable Indians in the fort. Arming themselves, and cocking their rifles, they proceeded directly to the little garrison, menacing death to any or all who should oppose their nefarious designs. Some friend of the hostage-chiefs attempted to apprise them in advance of the approaching danger; but the savage mob were probably too close upon the heels of the messenger to allow of their escape. At the sound of the clamor without, Ellinipsico is said to have been somewhat agitated. Not so the veteran Cornstalk. He had too often grappled with death on the war-path to fear his approaches now. Perceiving the emotion of his son, he calmly observed: — '*My son, the Great Spirit has seen fit that we should die together, and has sent you to that end. It is his will, and let us submit.*' The infuriated mob had now gained the apartment of the victims; Cornstalk fell, perforated with seven bullets, and died without a struggle. The son, after the exhortation of his father, met his fate with composure, and was shot on the seat upon which he was sitting. Redhawk, the young Delaware, died with less fortitude. He hid himself away, but was discovered and slain. Another friendly Indian, in the fort at the

time, was likewise killed, and his body mangled by the barbarians in a manner that would have disgraced savages of any other complexion." — pp. 192, 193.

These cases might be cited *ad infinitum.* For the relief of variety in a subject so repulsive at the best, let us take an instance of another class. We have alluded to the examples set before the Indians by the whites. During the Revolution, it is well known, they fought very much together, to some extent, on both sides, though chiefly, with Brant himself, on the British. The following incident occurred at Schoharie, in 1778. The savages had made one of their customary incursions, — they have never known any other mode of warfare, — and nearly an entire family, among other victims, were killed:

"They had just completed the work of death, when some loyalists of the party came up, and discovered an infant breathing sweetly in its cradle. An Indian warrior, noted for his barbarity, approached the cradle with his uplifted hatchet. The babe looked up in his face, and smiled; the feelings of nature triumphed over the ferocity of the savage; the hatchet fell with his arm, and he was about stooping down to take the innocent in his arms, when one of the loyalists, cursing him for his humanity, thrust it through with his bayonet, and, thus transfixed, held it up struggling in the agonies of death, as he exclaimed — '*This, too, is a rebel!*'" — pp. 311, 312.

After a multitude of details of this kind, the author remarks, that the Vale of Schoharie-kill was doomed to extraordinary sufferings from these ravages during the war; but, he adds, — which no other historian, to our knowledge, ever did, —

"Justice, nevertheless, demands the admission, that the first blood was drawn in that valley, and the first act of barbarity committed, *by the white man, upon the body of an Indian sachem.*" — p. 314.

This fact is proved at some length, but we need not repeat the details.

Nor shall we complete even an outline of similar aggressions on a greater scale, which occurred throughout the war, as they have occurred at all other times. Mr. Stone has overlooked none of them at least which came in his way, *coûte qu'il coûte;* and he frequently assumes the responsibility and drudgery of doing original justice to the parties, a justice neglected too long

by his predecessors. He speaks out plainly of General Sullivan's treatment of the friendly Mohawks, in 1779; and the same of General Wayne, on another occasion. But there is no end to such facts. How vast must be the great aggregate, then, of those of a like description, which never have been, nor can be, ascertained; — unascertained, we mean, by the American public, not by the Indians; we know *them* too well for such a conclusion.

We shall barely allude to one other source, rather a singular one of the prejudices, of which we have spoken above, created, in this case, on the other side. Mr. Stone cites the following passage from Ramsay, which sufficiently explains it; the date is 1775:

"Colonel Johnson had repeated conferences with the Indians, and endeavored to influence them to take up the hatchet, but they steadily refused. In order to gain their coöperation, he invited them to a feast on a Bostonian, and to drink his blood. This, in the Indian style, meant no more than to partake of a roasted ox and a pipe of wine at a public entertainment, which was given on design to influence them to coöperate with the British troops. The colonial patriots affected to understand it in its literal sense. *It furnished, in their mode of explication, a convenient handle for operating on the passions of the people.*" — p. 88.

We can probably form no conception, at this period, of the extent or effect of this mere partisan misrepresentation. Mr. Stone cites the well-known Franklin scalp-story, as an instance in point; and he justly remarks, in his Introduction, that it was

"The policy of the public writers, and those in authority, not only to magnify actual occurrences, but sometimes, when these were wanting, to draw upon their imaginations for accounts of such deeds of ferocity and blood as might best serve to keep alive the strongest feelings of indignation against the parent country, and likewise induce the people to take the field for revenge, if not driven thither by the nobler impulse of patriotism." — p. xvi.

The subject, however, is too fertile; it must be left where it is. We should like to go through this whole Life of Brant, with a view to the illustration and proof, at once, of the justness of the praise we have bestowed on the author, and of the positions regarding the relations between the two races, and

especially the real character of the red men, — in which we have found ourselves compelled, by all manner of evidence, and by every consideration of reason and philosophy, to concur with him. Of course, he devotes his efforts especially to the work of clearing up the fame of his hero. This he has accomplished with triumphant success. Brant was a wonderful genius, as he proves thoroughly; but he was a great-spirited, a noble-hearted creature, as well; and this he also proves; the position, in our opinion, will never be disputed again. In this achievement the author has rendered a service to history, as well as to abstract morality, which can hardly be too highly esteemed. Had he done nothing but this, — had his attention in this work been exclusively devoted to Brant alone, — still he would have rendered a mighty service in behalf of the whole race the Chieftain belonged to; for he would have set up before the world, and before posterity, one most signal instance, at least as such, of a great multitude of like cases, — a most eloquent suggestion, a perfect illustration, of thousands more, — and an encouragement, moreover, for future historians to do like him. But he has done much more. His whole work is a series of corrections and restorations of public estimates of character, and other subjects in which the Indians are concerned. It would give us the sincerest pleasure to furnish our readers with a score or two of passages of this description, but our limits compel us to forbear.

Neither can we do justice to the corresponding work of correction which Mr. Stone has carried on respecting his history at large. In these cases, as in those already referred to, it should be borne in mind, as an important addition to his other merits, that what he does is done in good temper. There is no Quixotism about it. The strictest impartiality is exercised, as far as we can follow him. He takes the same pains almost, to clear up the character of Burgoyne, of the Johnsons, of the infamous Butlers of Wyoming memory, of any and every party, however odious, who enters the scene of action, as he does to vindicate Brant himself. His magnanimity in the treatment of some of these people, indeed, is almost provoking. We admit and admire the virtue of it, but confess at the same time to feeling almost out of patience with a historian of such imperturbable Roman integrity and coolness; we feel an inclination for a sort of historical Lynch Law to be practised upon these subjects; we almost cry aloud for their being tarred and feathered on the spot.

A word on the style of this work. We cannot quite rank it in this respect with some of the recent historical compositions, of a highly classical character, produced in our own vicinity, and which have attracted a large share of public attention. With great fluency, liveliness, and ease of manner, gracefully adapting itself to the subject, and rising with that not unfrequently to a high order of graphic and stirring eloquence, especially in description, — higher, perhaps, than anything of the kind to be found in the writings of his contemporaries which we refer to; — there is still, not unfrequently, an inexactness, and occasionally an incorrectness in his phraseology. These are so obviously the result of mere heat and haste, and so easily amended, that we shall not fear meeting them in the many future editions of this work, to which we are sure it is destined. We refer to such expressions as these:

"So long as English poetry exists, will the imaginary tale of Gertrude of Wyoming be read, admired, and *wept*," &c. — Vol. I. p. 318.

This may be said *in* poetry, perhaps, but certainly not *of* it, — not in history, at least. More of a question may be made, for aught we know, over the following:

"The great western tribes becoming more and more *restif*." — Vol. I. p. 347.

Though we suppose this epithet (not very dignified at the best) to mean, strictly, just the reverse of what the author apparently intended here to say. At all events, he will not defend the sentence —

"Until, indeed, his troops became impatient *to a degree*," —

a license which, if we mistake not, is several times repeated, and seems quite a favorite with the author. Such language, used colloquially, excites no surprise. It may be excused, even to the *Editor of the Commercial Advertiser*, it being considered how busy that gentleman must be; but we hope to see it weeded carefully out of the *Life of Brant*. On the whole, if the style of Mr. Stone (owing partly, it may be, to these same professional habits just referred to) is not always quite so condensed and crisp as might be desired; if it shows generally, as well as in particular cases, the marks less of a Roman severity or Grecian finish than of an American energy, readiness, and spirit; if, to repeat a homely figure we have used before.

and using words that suit our purpose as boldly as he does, an occasional lack of mature seasoning shows itself in here a *warp*, and there a *seam*, — these, after all, are trivial considerations when compared with the great, sterling, standard merits for which we have given him credit; with the reform he may be said to have fairly introduced into our Indian annals; with his vast and various original contributions to American history at large, — the romantic interest as well as the authentic value of a large part of these restorations, — his impartial, liberal, and manly spirit, — the high moral and Christian tone which breathes through the whole of his writings, — or even with that never-failing animation and raciness in his style itself, which, wrought into such material, have filled these thick octavos with a life which fiction, with all its strangeness, aims at in vain. These are excellences of the first and finest order. They are body and soul enough for any historical composition. They will give to this work an enviable rank among its contemporaries, a lively and lasting interest in the memories of men.

B. B. T.

ART. II. — 1. *American Education, or Strictures on the Nature, Necessity, and Practicability of a System of National Education, suited to the United States.* By Rev. BENJAMIN O. PEERS. With an Introductory Letter by FRANCIS L. HAWKS, D. D. New York: J. S. Taylor. 1838. 12mo. pp. 364.

2. *Home Education.* By ISAAC TAYLOR, Author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm," "Physical Theory of Another Life," etc. etc. New York. First American from second London Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1838. 12mo. pp. 322.

DR. JOHNSON'S crusty remark, that "Education is as well known, and has long been as well known, as ever it can be," does not seem to be a part of the creed of our age. Alike in the philosopher's closet and the legislative hall, — in the radical's harangues and the despot's councils, — a constant effort is making to devise a more thorough mode of Education, and to

render its blessings universal. Even the Russian Autocrat joins in the movement, and threatens to surpass, in wisdom and liberality, the rulers of some of our free States.

The two works at the head of this Article lay the subject of Education before us in all its length and breadth. It is the aim of the first to insist upon the necessity of educating all the people by means of common schools. The second concerns itself more with making education thorough, than universal; and seeks to set forth a higher plan of culture than can be pursued in public schools, or even in private schools; and to show that the human faculties may reach their best development under the family roof. Let us first see what Mr. Peers's views are, and then look at Mr. Taylor's book.

Mr. Peers has been quite conspicuous and efficient as a friend of education in the West. He has for many years been actively engaged as a teacher, and was, for a while, the head of Transylvania University. He has a right, therefore, to speak with something of the authority of experience. He might safely have trusted his book to make its own way by its intrinsic excellence, and the merits of his own name, without having it hawked into notice by one of those introductions, that generally only serve to awake suspicion that a book needs puffing to keep it from sinking. It is rather unfortunate, in the present case, that the Introductory Letter to a work on Education should be so hasty, and should not afford a better specimen of correct grammar.

Mr. Peers argues, that an infant is as much entitled to the growth of his mind as he is to the growth of his body; and that the right of education ought to be ranked among the natural and unalienable rights of man. He maintains that, as a matter of course, every citizen has a claim upon society for such a cultivation as shall make him fully competent to discharge the duties which society requires of him. He considers these three questions:

"What kind and amount of education do the circumstances of society in the United States require *all its members* should receive?

"What, and how much is every child, irrespectively of the character or condition of its parents, entitled to claim, and government consequently bound to give?

"And what arrangements had best be made for the purpose

of complying with this requirement, of meeting these claims, and of discharging this obligation?"—p. 21.

After enlarging and insisting on the especial need of education, particularly moral and religious, in a republic like ours, he proceeds to state and illustrate what he deems to be the essential features in a system of national instruction suited to the United States:

"The essential features, in a system of national education suited to the United States, I consider to be seven; as expressed in the following propositions:

"1. A system of national education suited to the United States must aim, above all things, to impress a virtuous character upon the rising generation, and by means of the Bible as the instrument.

"2. In educating the intellectual faculties, it should be guided (with reference both to methods of practice, and the information to be communicated) by the laws of mind, and the future wants of the individual; and not, as is generally the case, by a too subservient and blind regard to usage.

"3. It must make such arrangements as will ensure the attendance at school of every child of the proper age.

"4. It must cause them to continue at school for a period of seven years.

"5. It must establish seminaries for the professional education of a sufficient number of teachers.

"6. It must provide means for their accommodation and comfortable support; and,

"7. For the supervision and general execution of its plans, it must appoint wise and energetic superintendents."—pp. 91, 92.

In discussing the second proposition, as to the kind of education suited to our circumstances, he remarks:

"To collect materials for giving *a proper* answer to the question proposed, (so far, at least, as relates to intellectual education, the immediate subject of this chapter,) I would station myself beside 'the stump' and the ballot-box, on the day of an election, and there learn the mental habits, and the information, requisite, to enable the farmers and mechanics, the principal voters of the nation, to distinguish the artful sophistry of the demagogue, from the manly logic of the friend of order and of the Constitution; and to choose, intelligently, between two candidates, whose views of national policy may be as opposite as day and night. I would then repair to our legislative halls; and hearing the

yeomanry of the country uttering their wishes, and opinions, through their representative organs, I would inquire as to the kind of education that will fit them for doing so with wisdom and with safety. Thence I would go into the business walks of life, to ascertain what knowledge of things, and principles, is needed to facilitate the task of getting honestly a comfortable livelihood. In the social circle, next, I would learn the mental qualifications necessary to make recreation rational, and profitable, as well as pleasant. Then, by the domestic fireside, I would determine the amount of moral science requisite for a wise discharge of the duties of the father, the son, the brother, the relation, the neighbor, and the friend. And lastly; beneath the shadow of the sacred desk, I would form my views of the attainments which are essential to fit a man for being happy in the faithful discharge of all his duties upon earth, and to prepare him for the purer blessedness of Heaven." — pp. 99, 100.

Mr. Peers has much to say upon the need of religious culture in common schools, and in all that he says shows great good sense, and what seems to us a singular liberality in a clergyman of the Episcopal Church. He is entirely opposed to the introduction of any of the dogmas of controversial theology into schools. His view of the moral susceptibilities is cheering. He maintains "that children are religious beings; that is, they have consciences and affections, peculiarly susceptible of religious impressions; and the failure to treat them as such, can only be regarded as an act of criminal, not to say unpardonable, infidelity." Again, he remarks, "he (the instructor) should address himself to the tender sensibilities of childhood, by means of the mild and melting considerations with which the gospel abounds; and he should make close and specific appeals to their consciences, remembering that the sense of moral obligation in children is peculiarly delicate and acute. The meaning of the expressions 'ought' and 'ought not' is perfectly comprehended by them. There are, in reality, and to the unsophisticated mind of childhood, no simpler words in our language."

He does not try to set forth any specific plan for religious instruction in our schools, nor to decide the difficult and much vexed question, what use shall be made of the Bible. His own plan has been to give the first morning hour to religion, in form of reading the Scriptures, singing and prayer. He opposes the use of the Bible as a common reading book in schools, and

thinks there is great demand for a work "which shall amount to an exact, judicious, and specific answer to the question, which relates to the best method of employing the Bible in schools, and shall be fitted to serve as a help and guide to teachers in this respect." A work of this kind would, in his opinion, do more than anything else to remove all doubt about the practicability of using the Scriptures habitually in schools, without offending sectarian feelings. But there's the rub. Who shall prepare such a book? Who shall speak of the Bible in such way as not to offend sectarians on the one hand, nor on the other hand alarm the fears of a people ever jealous of sects and religionists? So long as Christians regard Christianity as based on controverted dogmas, — so long as the people regard the Church as a selfish party, or band of parties, so long the Bible will be, if not absolutely kept out of common schools, used with much timidity and jealousy, and with little good effect. Even in the city that boasts to be the most moral and religious in the land, if not in the world, the assembled wisdom of her teachers and clergy could not even agree that religion should be taught in schools, much less devise a plan for teaching it.

We do actually believe, that the good yeomanry of our country would be more likely to agree upon a system of moral and religious instruction for schools, than our clergy would. They would discern, that the love of God and man, justice, truth, temperance, and even the eternal life, were principles acknowledged by the great mass of the church and people; and insisting upon these, they would leave controversialists to dispute at will about their *isms* and *ologies*. We remember being very much struck, last summer, with the effect produced upon the legislature of a State remarkably jealous of church influence, by a lecture upon the mode of moral and religious culture in the schools of Germany. The democratic yeomanry looked rather hard at the Rev. Lecturer, when he stated his topic. But when he proceeded to unfold what he meant by moral and religious culture, their faces changed from distrust and suspicion to interest and delight. All parties were charmed. The orthodox legislators were delighted to hear so much said of the importance of a right heart. The sturdiest democrats gave up their fears about mingling Church and State. If this be religion, said some of them, — if religion consist in the development of our moral and spiritual capacities, if its main

doctrines be the love of God and man, as shown in works of justice, piety, and benevolence, — the more and the sooner we have it in our schools, the better.

Is not the doctrine, that Christianity is but a revelation of Eternal Truth, and of the perfection of Mind, and not an arbitrary dogma, actually a strange idea to the majority of our people, and even of the nominal Church? Who shall be the Apostle of this idea with such power as to convince free nations that, in diffusing the Bible and Christianity, they are not aiding mere sects and parties, but spreading Eternal Truth, and shedding bright and far the beams of that Light, which, though faintly, lighteth every man that cometh into the world, and shines fully in Jesus.

But without expecting that such a one will soon come, or that the Bible will soon be a universally efficient text-book in our schools, we may hope for some speedy improvements in means of moral and religious instruction. We know not how a better suggestion can be made, than that contained in the "First Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education" in this State. We wonder, by the bye, that Mr. Peers has so overlooked the recent movement in behalf of education, in our State. There is more practical wisdom and high principle combined in Mr. Mann's Report, than in anything in the same compass that we have ever met with. But to our extract:

"One of the greatest and most exigent wants of our schools, at the present time, is a book, portraying, with attractive illustration and with a simplicity adapted to the simplicity of childhood, the obligations arising from social relationships; making them stand out, with the altitude of mountains, above the level of the engrossments of life; — not a book written for the copyright's sake, but one emanating from some comprehension of the benefits of supplying children, at an early age, with simple and elementary notions of right and wrong in feeling and in conduct, so that the appetites and passions, as they spring up in the mind, may, by a natural process, be conformed to the principles, instead of the principles being made to conform to the passions and appetites." — p. 65.

Mr. Peers closes his work by an earnest appeal to the clergy, and rebukes them for their too general inefficiency in the cause of education. He maintains that the present means relied upon for diffusing religion, — such as the family, the pulpit, the

Sunday school, the boarding school, — are altogether inadequate. He deems the Government and the Church to be alike in danger from popular ignorance. Yet both seem to have acted as if their interests were at variance. "They appear to have been trying opposite experiments; the Church, by her neglect of general education, endeavoring to dipense with popular intelligence, — and the Government with Religion." The rebuke of the clergy applies more to the latitude in which it was written, than to our own.

We now turn to a book about as different from the one we have been considering, as could well be. We find that, in the outset, the author of "Home Education" lays down the principle that no schools can give such good and thorough culture to the powers, as private instruction in the family. Instead of concerning himself with so improving common schools as to induce the children of the affluent and fastidious to attend them, he rather disparages public education, and unfolds an elaborate system for the instruction of young persons from infancy to early manhood at home. In style and thought the two writers differ as much as in doctrine. The style of the one is hard and often obscure. The style of the other is diffuse and plain enough, but not remarkable for anything. The one is speculative, and often original, though not devoid of practical wisdom and experience. The other does not make any pretensions to depth or originality. Those who have read the "Natural History of Enthusiasm," or "Physical Theory of Another Life," or any of Mr. Taylor's striking volumes, will not expect a play-day when they undertake to read "Home Education." He gives his readers many hard nuts to crack, but the kernel generally well pays for the trouble.

Mr. Taylor's whole doctrine is opposed to our common American ideas, and therefore the more deserves our attention. He opposes the common wholesale education of the young, and makes mortal war with the prevalent haste for early excitement and development. Our people think that since boys are to join in the busy crowd, when they arrive at manhood, the sooner and the more they mingle in the throng, the better; and that a large school is the best discipline for real life. Mr. Taylor argues, that the very fact that boys must, in time, mingle with the bustling and impassioned crowd, is a reason for keeping them by themselves in early life, so that a decided and consolidated character may be formed, and they may go forth

into life, not to be assimilated to the vulgar multitude, but able to exert a positive individual influence. Again, the rage with us is for an early culture of all the powers; the more forward a child is, the better the teacher, the better the hope. A great doctrine of the work before us, lies in the principle of late and even repressed development. Instead of forcing open the young bud, Mr. Taylor deems that the longer it remains closed, the brighter and more enduring will be the bloom of the flower.

His reasons for preferring a private to a public education are thus summed up and qualified:

"1st. That the stress of the process may be made to rest upon the best sentiments, and upon the reciprocal affections of the teacher and the taught, instead of its falling upon law, and routine, and mechanism: 2dly, That everything, in method and in matter, may be exactly adapted to the individual capacities and tastes of the learner, and the utmost advantage secured for every special talent: 3dly, That it is, or may be, wholly exempt from the incumbrance and despotism of statutes, or of immemorial, but perhaps irrational usages, or of prevalent notions, and may come altogether under the control of good sense; and is free to admit every approved practice: and 4thly, That, whereas public education is necessarily a system of hastened development, private education is free to follow out the contrary principle of retarded development.

"If it had come within my purpose to discuss the general question of the comparative advantages, on the whole, of the two systems, many other points must have been adverted to; and especially so, if the moral and religious bearing of the subject had been included in such an argument. But although this general question is here held in abeyance, I would not even seem to be unmindful of the many and powerful reasons which may induce parents, even if home education be in their case practicable, yet to send their children, or at least their sons, to school. Such are — the superior practical ability of masters who have devoted their lives to particular branches of instruction; — the advantage, so important to boys, of finding their level among many; — the stirring and healthful influence of emulation; — the means of acquiring self-confidence, and the probability of learning good sense and common discretion, as well as pliability, on that wider field; and not least, the salubrious animal excitement, the buoyant inspiration of high sport, which is to be had on the play-ground, and for which, it is extremely difficult to find an efficient substitute in the quietness of home." — pp. 14, 15.

It is evident that many of our author's views are inapplicable to this country. He indeed says, that his plan of culture can be best carried out in an English country-house. Comparatively few among us have the means of employing private tutors in their families, and still fewer parents are able to superintend the education of their children at home; and surely, private tutors, who could be engaged for a small salary, must be far inferior to our best instructers in public as well as private schools. Our institutions, too, demand a public education. The sooner boys learn to feel as fellow-citizens, and to mingle interests, friendships, and even competitions, the better hope of their future efficiency and happiness. And yet, on the other hand, the strong tendency, in our country, towards uniformity of manner and opinion, and the too timid deference to the will of the majority, demands to be corrected by that hearty affection and firm principle that a good home-breeding alone can give. How shall the two ends be gained? Private schools cannot do it. There is no more independence — no purer feelings in these than in public schools; there is often more gentility of manner, but seldom more purity of soul; and wherever there are bad boys in a private school, their corrupting influence being exerted upon a small number, and being in close contact, is likely to be the more fatal. The best way of gaining at the same time the advantage of public and private education, would be to unite the two: so improve our common schools, that all boys, at least within a certain age, may attend them with profit; and, at the same time, let a faithful home-breeding keep pace with public instruction; — let parents watch over the intellectual progress of their children, show constant interest in their studies, and above all, let home be the place where the heart's best affections are nurtured, as in an healthful atmosphere, whose power is all the mightier from its being constant and unforced. Is there not demand for some reform in college life, and would not the chances of worth and happiness be far greater with students, if, while they are in the University, they are also blessed with a home, if not with their parents, certainly with some kind and agreeable family? Surely our Colleges, upon their present plan, inspire a roughness and almost barbarity of feeling and manner, which attend many men through life, and which the graces and affections of a happy home would entirely correct. Much attention has been given to this subject of late; and Universities have been

assiduously fixed in cities, so as to give young men a liberal education without taking them from their homes. Whether the comforts and virtues of home be enough to counterbalance the dangers of a city residence, remains to be decided by experience.

What our author says of the Home Education of girls deserves especial attention. These, he deems beyond all doubt, should be kept from large schools, and if possible be taught at home. It is, perhaps, well enough for men to be early acquainted with evil, and to learn to resist it. But the less a woman knows of the world's depravity, the greater is the charm and purity of her character. Here is a good remark on the influence of home-bred girls:

"Girls should then be educated at home with a constant recollection that their brothers, and the future companions of their lives, are, at the same time, at school, making certain acquisitions indeed, — dipping into the Greek drama, and the like; but receiving a very partial training of the mind, in the best sense; or perhaps only such a training as chance may direct: and that they will return to their homes, wanting in genuine sentiments, and in the refinements of the heart. Girls, well taught at home, may tacitly compel their brothers to feel, if not to confess, when they return from school, that, although they may have gone some way beyond their sisters in mere scholarship, or in mathematical proficiency, they are actually inferior to them in variety of information, in correctness of taste, and in general maturity of understanding; as well as in propriety of conduct, in self-government, in steadiness and elevation of principle, and in force and depth of feeling. With young men of ingenuous tempers, this consciousness of their sisters' superiority, in points which every day they will be more willing to deem important, may be turned to the best account, under a discreet parental guidance, and may become the means of the most beneficial reaction in their moral sentiments." — pp. 20, 21.

In reference to his subject, Mr. Taylor considers carefully the three eras of early life, — infancy, childhood, youth. When, however, he speaks of these as the three easily distinguishable and well understood eras to which education applies; and when he says that infancy terminates with the fifth year, childhood in the eleventh or twelfth, and the period of adolescence in the seventeenth, it must not be forgotten that the characteristics of infancy sometimes disappear in the fourth

year, and sometimes continue unchanged to the tenth; and that the season of childhood differs, in its commencement and close, often by as much as five years.

Infancy is Nature's own season, and our author would leave Nature to her own free course. It is the season for animal growth, — especially for the brain to attain a healthy expansion and consolidation. During this period, whatever might tend to irritate or disturb the nervous system, is utterly to be condemned. This is the season, also, for allowing to the senses their spontaneous education, and for observing things as creation shows them:

"Infancy, as I have said, is, emphatically, Nature's season; and parents may be thoroughly contented, so far, who see their children reach the verge that separates infancy from childhood in blooming health, — happy, in habit and in temper; with transparent dispositions, with a curiosity alive, with a moderate command of language; and, if I may be allowed the figure, with a lap full of the blossoms of philosophy, unsorted and plucked as they have come to hand.

"One might even say less than this; and yet affirm, that the period of infancy has passed auspiciously, if only the cheek be ruddy, the eye sparkling, the sympathies prompt and kind, and the habit of implicit obedience thoroughly formed. Happy are the parents who are devising the more elaborate processes of education, and are just commencing what may be called the business of instruction, with children of seven and eight years old, of whom as much as has now been stated might be affirmed, — and nothing more.

"In a word, if the anxious inquiry of some parents, in relation to infancy and early childhood, is — What are the most effectual means of development? the inquiry which I would substitute for such a question, is of this sort — How shall we best pass over the same period without any development but what is wholly spontaneous?" — pp. 114, 115.

Childhood, the second period of early life, embracing six or seven years, is the time during which the brain having nearly reached its organic perfection, the bodily system is to expand and be consolidated. The animal economy still demands our care, and all excitements tending to disturb the physical growth ought to be avoided. Yet childhood is the season when conscious life begins, and the soul first recognises its own individuality, and inquires concerning itself and its well being. It

becomes conscious of the passage of time, and demands occupation, either by labor or amusement. It shows the endeavor to connect and arrange, in some way, its acquired stock of ideas, and to ask questions as to the agreements and causes of such facts, as have come within its observation. It is the season for giving the mind the first principles of mental order; and since the most obvious of these principles are those relating to *time*, *place*, *form*, and *causation*, something is to be done towards giving consistency to a child's perceptions and acquirements regarding these. Childhood, moreover, is distinguished by great moral sensibility and intuitive sense of the characters of those around. This trait is accompanied with great shrewdness in detecting absurdities, long before the reason of the absurdity has been discovered. The author insists much upon the importance of a happy infancy and childhood:

"The recollection of a thoroughly happy childhood (other advantages not wanting) is the very best preparation, moral and intellectual, with which to encounter the duties and cares of real life. A sunshine childhood is an auspicious inheritance, with which, as a fund, to commence trading in practical wisdom and active goodness. It is a great thing only to have known, by experience, that tranquil, temperate felicity is actually attainable on earth; and we should think so if we knew how many have pursued a reckless course, because, — or chiefly because, they early learned to think of HAPPINESS as a chimera, and believed momentary gratifications to be the only substitute placed within the reach of man. Practicable happiness is much oftener wantonly thrown away, than really snatched from us; but it is the most likely to be pursued, overtaken, and husbanded by those who already, and during some considerable period of their lives, have been happy. To have known nothing but misery is the most portentous condition under which human nature can start on its course." — p. 33.

The tenth and eleventh years are, Mr. Taylor thinks, the season when internal revolutions take place, as well in the dispositions as in the intellect. Remarkable faculties now show something of themselves, if ever, and signs appear of fitness for some particular calling. Now, too, appears a thoughtfulness, or tendency to muse upon the conditions of human life; "as if the mind, in reaching the first hillock on its journey, were halting a moment to ponder the landscape before it":

"It seems as if each marked era of human life were preceded by a season of thoughtfulness, often indeed diverted by cares, follies, passions, or eager interests; but indicating itself wherever the mind is sufficiently sedate, and its position sufficiently settled, to allow a tranquil interior change to become perceptible on the surface. At these moments, and in connexion, no doubt, with physical changes, a tinge of melancholy pervades the mind, and the balanced good and ill of existence is surveyed. The mind too, at such seasons, tries its strength upon those insoluble problems which sages have so often professed to have disposed of, but which still continue to torment human reason, even from its earliest dawn. There are indications sometimes of a crisis of this sort in the fifth year; still more decisively in the tenth or eleventh; and again in the eighteenth. It is at these moments that the soul comes to a stand, for an instant, and asks — Whither am I going?" — pp. 132, 133.

When boyhood succeeds to childhood, or about the twelfth year, the time arrives for the youth to learn to manage for himself, — to court hardihood and courage, — to learn enterprise and endurance of fatigue. Now there is need especially of keeping the reasoning faculty free to its own spontaneous action, and to avoid cramping it by formalities and prejudice. Now too, enough may be learned of children's natural capacity, to enable the parent to assign them severally to one or the other of two classes, — the intellectual, who are to receive an elaborate and extended mental culture, and the unintellectual, who are to be fitted for business or for business-like engagements, and whose education, of whatever sort, must or may well be brought to a close at an early age. At the fourteenth year, the author thinks, a boy's professional tastes and powers may be discerned, and his education begin to have some reference to his future way of life. Here the advantage of home education especially appears, — the adaptation of methods of culture to individual diversities of taste and talent.

At this period it becomes necessary to avoid two errors, — first, the error of a too hasty or too confident decision in relation to a child's general ability or particular turn; secondly, the error of allowing our own plans to be overruled by the supposed ability, or particular tastes, or the assumed incapacity of a child. The chapter on modes of treating the various instances of intellectual conformation, both those which exhibit defects of intellectual structure, and those which show particular

talent, whether executive, philosophic, or poetic, contains many excellent and original suggestions.

The last part of the work is devoted to an analysis of the intellectual faculties, and an exposition of the order and plan in which they should be addressed and developed. We will not stop either to illustrate or dispute Mr. Taylor's analysis of the intellectual faculties. It is certainly correct enough for practical purposes. In fact, all quarrelling between metaphysicians generally ceases, when they give themselves to the inquiry, How and in what order shall the human faculties be cultivated? The Sensual Philosophy and the Transcendental agree in the principle laid down by our author, that the Conceptive faculty should be regarded first, as coming first in Nature's order, — that power by which, what has been present to perception returns in the absence of its object, and notions derived from the senses become the mind's permanent property. After the notions of external objects are in the mind, then the sense of Resemblance comes and compares and arranges them. Then comes the sense of Analogy, and compares the relations of ideas, and perceives the harmony or discord of various classes of ideas. Next in order, the power of Abstraction should be educated; and with it the Reasoning faculty; and lastly the Imagination. If the reader marvel that the Imagination should be placed last, let him remember that what is often said about the ardor of imagination in childhood and youth, refers not to what is properly called imagination, but to fancy, or the mind's play with the images of the Conceptive faculty, according to their resemblances and contrasts. "The imagination and the imaginative sentiments are the very last to be developed, when nature takes her own course; it is the rich-colored chrysanthemum of the intellectual parterre; — while the Conceptive power is the very earliest to appear of the properly intellectual elements of our nature; the snow-drop of the mind's flower garden."

The closing chapters give many novel and valuable suggestions concerning the culture of the Conceptive faculty, the sense of Resemblance and Analogy. The author wages mortal war with the old system of education, which teaches first the technical terms of a science, then its philosophic principles or results, and last of all, the facts to which these technicalities relate, and upon which these principles and results are based. We give a single illustration of his meaning:

"What is termed the Use of the Globes, and which might better be called the abuse of them, if we are speaking of early education, affords another instance of that, as I think, mistaken practice which, while it offends nature, actually shuts out intelligence from all but the most resolutely intellectual minds. Instead of placing before the learner, in the first place, the palpable, visible, and picturesque facts of physical astronomy, and physical geography, and which very few children would fail to listen to with delight; the teacher, book in hand, or worse, forcing the book into the hands of the learner, afflicts him in some such style as this: — 'The Colures are two great circles, imagined to intersect each other at right angles in the poles of the world: one of them passes through the solstitial, and the other through the equinoctial point of the ecliptic, whence the first is denominated the solstitial, and the second the equinoctial colure. This last determines equinoxes, and the former the solstices,' &c. Such is the style in which mere children are too often introduced to the sciences, and for ever alienated from all kinds of substantial knowledge. The paragraph I have taken from only the sixth page of a much used school book, if rendered into Dutch or Chinese, would have been not a whit less beneficial to thousands of those who, in their sorrowful school-days, have learned, repeated, and instantly afterwards forgotten it. It is not that the technical parts of the sciences should not be learned, but that they should be kept out of sight until after the mind has become familiar with the visible realities to which they relate.

"A description of the earth, combining many topics, separately treated of in five or six sciences, — that is to say, astronomy, geography, geology, hydrography, mineralogy, meteorology, and, to some extent, natural history, affords as good an opportunity as we can any where find for calling the Conceptive Faculty into play, and for enriching it with splendid ideas. What we want, in the training of this faculty, is, to accustom the mind to stretch out from the boundary of things actually seen, and to give itself a sort of intellectual ubiquity, by the vigorous effort which realizes remote scenes as analogous to surrounding objects, and yet as unlike them. A child is to be tempted on, until he breaks over his horizon; he is to be exercised and informed, until he can wing his way, north or south, east or west, and show his teacher, in apt and vivid language, that his imagination has actually taken the leap, and has returned — from the tempest-rocked Hebrides, or the ice-bound northern ocean, from the red man's wilderness of the west, from the steppes of central Asia, from the teeming swamps of the Amazon, from the sirocco deserts of Africa, from the tufted islets of the Pacific, from the

heaving flanks of Etna, from the marbled shores of Greece." — pp. 203, 204.

While we are speaking of the need of cultivating clear conceptions and simple, graphic expressions, we may give the author a friendly knock with a weapon of his own furnishing. Mr. Taylor, we are sure, must speak from bitter experience of the need of clear conceptions and simple words. There is little simplicity and graphic power in his pages. He uses abstract terms needlessly, and has a style as little attractive as any writer of the day. There is not a single chapter in any of his works, in which the reader is not made to ache with trying to follow the writer through some craggy and misty paragraph. We think, too, that his admirable chapter on Language should teach him better than to be fond of repeatedly using such words as "perfunctory," when a plain Saxon monosyllable would better give the meaning.

We take leave of "Home Education" and its author with much gratitude, and yet not without some disappointment. The most interesting points in family culture are but slightly touched upon, — we mean the moral and religious bearings of the subject. The education of the moral and religious faculties, and also of the reason and imagination, he reserves for future consideration. We should delight to see a work from his pen, reviewing the moral and religious characteristics of early life, as he has reviewed its intellectual characteristics. We want a true history of the dawning mind and heart, — a natural history of human life, not of the eras in the physical being, but of the stages and crises in the soul. We wish to see that done for the individual soul, which God in his word has done for our race, — a history of religion in the individual, as God has given us the history of religion in the race. We would see the *Eden* period of infancy portrayed, — the season of spontaneous joy and faith, which no thought of shame, or toil, or sin, or death, has yet disturbed. We would see a faithful picture of childhood, — the period of the *law*, when the young mind must walk by the authority of others, and when, too, it has learned something of sin and shame and toil and death. Finally, we should delight to behold a faithful portraiture of that season of youth, when the soul wrestles with the great troubles and strives with the great enigmas of its being, — when childhood's spontaneous faith is reviewed, and either rejected

or confirmed by reflection, — when the burden of toil is realized, and man knows that he must work, and makes up his mind, whether to work as a slave chained to his task, or a free child in his Heavenly Father's house, and for a heavenly reward, — when the mystery of death and its woes are felt, and death either owned as a curse, or gloried in as giving ground for the Christian's hope.

That Mr. Taylor possesses all the qualifications to write upon "Home Education," especially its moral and religious bearings, cannot be presumed, even by his admirers. His mind is too hard and abstract for the work. His faith and philosophy are well enough for the task, but if there were more of the woman, both in his disposition, and his style and intellect, he would be fully qualified to meet his subject. Indeed, it is to be doubted, whether any one but a woman and a mother is competent to treat of "Home Education" in its most important sense. A successful writer on this subject should have the heart and experience of a woman, and the philosophical intellect of a man.

We ought to deem it one of the good signs of the times, that so much attention has of late been given to the family home, and its importance as a school has been so insisted upon. The homes of mankind decide the destiny of our race. If, indeed, we were to guide ourselves by history, or by the opinions of the world, we should attach exclusive glory to the extraordinary scenes and emergencies in the course of events, — we should measure the progress of our race by its illustrious battles, its signal deeds, its brilliant inventions and characters. But far otherwise should we do, if guided by the light of true philosophy. If we would learn how our race has advanced in what is truly valuable, we should turn away from the glowing record of battles gained or lost, and dynasties rising or falling, and should ask ourselves how are mankind advancing in the common affairs of life? what is their daily industry, and what are their homes? The homes of mankind are a better criterion of their progress, than their palaces and trophies. And thanks be to God, that the annals of the fireside bear witness to such an advance in civilization and virtue. Once the home had no such blessing around it as it now has. It was little better than the lair in which the wild beast takes temporary shelter. Now, through the influence of civilization and Christianity, — that mightiest agent in civilization, — home has become the centre of all that is pure and dear in affection, and all that is valuable

in art and refinement. We rejoice in every effort to increase the glory of the Christian Fireside. Let our homes be held in honor; they should be most honorable. It is there that our happiness is most promoted or harmed, — it is there that the young receive their earliest and most enduring impressions, — it is there that the world's selfish business and passions may be forgotten in a circle of happy hearts, — it is there that in sickness we may meet with those soothing attentions that almost make sickness a blessing, by throwing around it such a halo of love, — it is there that we may expect to lie down on our death-beds, and hope that the voice of kindred may cheer our last moments, and the hand of affection close our eyes in the last sleep. Let the home, therefore, be honored equally with the Senate Hall, the Court of Justice, the House of God. It is the cradle of the young, the great school of the forming mind. It should be the abode of our joy, the asylum of our sorrow, — the fountain of public virtue, the temple of our faith.

S. O.

Art. III. — Peace and Peace Societies.

To one, who wishes well for the best interests of his race, it is a cheering circumstance that the subject of Peace has, of late, attracted more attention than was formerly paid to it. That recklessness, with which, in past ages, nations rushed to arms on the slightest occasion, is now seldom witnessed. War, if now undertaken by any civilized power, is only as the last and most painful resort, when all other means have failed, for obtaining real or supposed justice. And when engaged in by any, the strife is not, as of old, regarded with indifference by surrounding nations; it is considered as an evil to the contending parties, and to the world at large; and other states, from just views of their own interest, and from a high principle of national brotherhood, interpose their good offices for its termination. Such is, and such must be, the tendency of an age, when the old and fierce prejudices of mankind are passing away before the rapidly extended facilities of mutual intercourse, —

when commerce connects the most distant lands in some bonds of common interest, and when the great civilizer, Christianity, is felt, more than ever before, as a principle of active benevolence, no less than of private piety.

It is not surprising, that, while such changes have occurred in the views and conduct of men in general, in regard to the custom of war, some, who shared in the prevalent feeling, should have been much more strongly affected by it than the community at large. Hence we trace the origin of the Peace Societies, which sprung up simultaneously in this country and in England, at the conclusion of the bloody wars which took their rise from the French Revolution. Whatever opinion may be formed respecting the particular views held by these societies, none can refuse to accord to their founders and promoters the praise of philanthropy in their undertaking, and of moderation and good temper, no less than indefatigable zeal, in its prosecution. With feelings strongly engaged upon a subject seemingly inseparable from politics, they have never, as far as we know, been accused of indulging in the spirit of political party; nor, though deriving their most powerful arguments from the Scriptures, have they exhibited that bitterness which is the besetting sin of religious controversialists. They have been consistently faithful to their own great principles of peace. May they ever so continue.

Yet willingly as we accord them this honor, it must be admitted, that the temper of the friends of peace has, thus far, been little tried by direct opposition, though, perhaps, fairly tested by a neglect which is still more hard to bear. Many have thought their organization useless; all, or nearly all, have admitted it to be benevolent in its intention and harmless in its results. Few or none, therefore, have thought it desirable to appear as opposers of a philanthropic society, even should they doubt the correctness of some of its principles, especially as they might thus seem to advocate the still more unpopular cause of war.

We are no opponents of the Peace Societies. We wish them God speed in their course of benevolence and usefulness. Yet, perhaps, it may rather advance than impede that cause, (supposing that our efforts are capable of affecting it at all,) if we point out some of the objections which are thought to exist against these institutions, and examine what degree of force they possess.

The objects, for which Peace Societies have been established in this country and elsewhere, are to collect and diffuse information relative to the evils of war, its inconsistency with the spirit of the Gospel, and the means, if any can be found, for diminishing these evils, and for removing war itself from the face of the earth; and further, to form and concentrate public opinion upon these subjects, so that the people, powerful under any form of government, and sovereign in ours, may learn and act on the principle, that their best interests are identified with the preservation of peace. Among those associated for these objects, some hold the sentiment of the Society of Friends, that war, under any circumstances, is forbidden by Christianity; but the majority, as far as has yet been ascertained, admit the lawfulness of such wars as are strictly defensive.

We need not spend much time in considering the question, whether the view last mentioned be correct. Resistance to invasion and oppression is so evidently authorized by the laws of nature, that none would think of censuring it, except under the idea that the natural liberty of man is limited by the direct command of heaven. To revelation, then, lies the appeal; and when it is remembered, that the first and still sacred revelation authorized not only defensive but offensive wars, and those sanguinary to a degree which modern customs would not tolerate, it is evident that in the New Testament, if anywhere, must the prohibition be found.

And we may be told that it is found there, in the precepts of love and gentleness given by the Savior. "I say unto you that ye resist not evil." "Love your enemies, do good to them that curse you, and pray for those that despitefully use you and persecute you." We admit the force of this, and much elsewhere, of our holy Redeemer's language. We admit, fully, the duty of exercising benevolent sentiments, and doing good, so far as is in our power, to all mankind. We admit that it may be often the duty of private individuals, and was of those whom our Lord addressed, to submit unresistingly to persecutions of every kind; but we do not think that the spirit or the letter of the Gospel requires the magistrate to abstain from punishing guilty individuals; nor do we believe that he prohibits the rulers of nations from defending those rights of which they are the sworn guardians, by the only means in their power. But public opinion is so decided on this subject, that extended argument is unnecessary. Defensive wars, then, are justifiable; and, as

no nation at the present day engages in hostilities, except on the ground of defending some real or supposed rights, the question of the lawfulness of war is one which must be settled by the national conscience, not once for all, but in each particular instance, in reference to that case alone.

If we admit that war is sometimes justifiable, it must be viewed as a state of things which, though in itself evil, may, under certain circumstances, become necessary to prevent or terminate still greater evils. And for such necessity a wise nation will always be prepared. This very preparation will be most likely to prevent the occasion from arising. If a people be known to be able and willing to defend their rights, those rights will be respected. It is on this principle, that our last war with England is justly considered as having had a successful termination, though the grievance which chiefly led to it, — the impressment of our seamen, — was not even alluded to in the treaty of peace. There was no occasion to allude to it. We had shown that the grievance was one which we would not submit to, and could successfully resist. In case of future war between England and any other power, no British minister will be mad enough to renew this oppression on our commerce, under the certainty of adding us to the number of his country's enemies.

To be prepared at all times for war is, then, among the most effectual means of preserving peace. But it can only be so, if the nation be content with the consciousness of strength and the security of her just rights, not dazzled by the false glitter of military glory. War must be viewed, as, at the best, a necessary evil; preferable, indeed, to the loss of independence, — preferable to that continued submission to injustice, which would encourage new and repeated aggression, — yet an evil in itself, among the greatest with which Providence permits this world to be afflicted. To promote this rational view, is a legitimate object for the exertion of influence by Peace Societies; and there is but little danger, that these should infuse too unwarlike a spirit into the people. The first notes of the drum, which shall call on our citizens to defend rights actually and dangerously assailed, will awaken enough of military ardor, notwithstanding all the representations that can be made of the evils of war. And if our soldiers go forth, when occasion requires, feeling that it is to a stern and painful, though necessary, duty, they will be more likely to fight bravely and successfully,

than if they regarded war as a pastime, or with the selfish aim of individual aggrandizement.

No objection of importance, then, can be brought against the organization of Peace Societies, from their possible influence in weakening the military spirit of the people. But perhaps a more serious argument against them may be drawn from the danger, that in time of actual or impending war, these institutions may become connected with the party politics of the day. Their tracts, addresses, meetings, in favor of peace, will be unexceptionable, so long as no subject of a practical nature is before the public, on the decision of which they can be supposed to bear; but let the important question arise of peace or war between our own and some foreign country, and there will seem scarce a choice left to these philanthropic bodies, but either to dissolve their association, or to connect their advocacy of peace with the exciting topic of the day. And under such circumstances, such is the strong influence of the principle of Association, in rendering the object for which men have associated of paramount importance in their minds to every other, that there is great reason to fear for the correctness of the decision which any body of men, thus circumstanced, would form. It may be said, and there is truth in the remark, that so great is the importance of peace, and so strong the impulse which induces numbers of the human race to wish for war, that it is well for as strong an influence as can be legitimately exerted, to be thrown into the opposite scale. Yet, let it not be forgotten, that there are blessings more valuable than peace itself, — liberty, justice, truth. He who feels that it is the duty of every citizen to give an unprejudiced vote in great national emergencies, will, if he enters into combination with others, to give general currency to the principles of peace, be careful at the same time to maintain the liberty, and to feel the undiminished responsibleness of his own will; and, if an occasion arise demanding vigorous action on the part of his country, he will form his own opinion and line of conduct, unbiased by his accidental connexion with others, as a calm and philanthropic Christian, indeed, but not the less as a patriotic citizen.

The associations of the friends of peace stand, indeed, upon similar ground with most of those philanthropic societies, which constitute so marked a feature of our age. All these associations are liable to abuse, chiefly from what has already been observed, that men, united for any one purpose, naturally learn

to regard that object as superior to all others, instead of estimating it in the due proportion of importance which it possesses. Hence have arisen many deplorable errors. But shall this powerful instrument of Association be rejected, because it may be abused? Is such our usual course with reference to other means of doing good? Do we cease to distribute the Scriptures, because we know that "the unlearned and unstable wrest them to their own destruction"? And because some advocates of the temperance cause may have used intemperate language, must we close our eyes to the great results which have attended the organized efforts in that cause for several years past? No. We may fitly compare this power of association, which has done and is doing so much for the moral improvement of the world, to the energy of steam, which has effected such changes in the physical condition of man, and in the prospects of society. We hear, with deep sympathy, of the loss of life, and the complicated suffering, which have resulted from the criminal abuse or neglect of controlling that mighty agent, in particular cases; but we think not of ceasing, on that account, to bend to our will this destructive energy. It is impossible that we should. The world cannot thus retrograde. As impossible is it that an intelligent people should relinquish the mighty moral power of associations, because that power may, at times, be abused. But they will take heed not to relinquish to these associations their individual freedom of opinion and of will, — they will strive still to view every subject of public interest fairly, estimating the comparative importance of each by the just standard of reason and of Scripture.

In particular should such caution be employed by those, whose sacred profession would render them doubly censurable, should they descend from the discussion of immortal principles of truth and duty, to the ephemeral strife of party politics. We are not of those, indeed, who think that a clergyman may not have an opinion beyond his study and his pulpit. He is not disfranchised by his profession; he has, as well as others, the rights and the duties of a citizen. But between the calm exercise of those rights and discharge of those duties, and the character of a political champion, there is a wide interval, which we trust the good sense of the American clergy and people will forever preserve. Whether it be the duty of a minister to connect himself or not with a society organized for so important, yet so political an object, as the suppression of

war, must be for every such individual to decide for himself; but if any be in doubt on such a point, he may be consoled by the reflection, that he can yet serve the cause of peace in the regular discharge of his own professional duty. In extending the influence of the Gospel, in enforcing the law of love, the fundamental principle of Christianity, he is exerting a power to which none can object, and coöperating with those combined efforts which may, perhaps, with more propriety and efficiency, be committed to secular hands.

We know not of any argument, beside those above considered, which can be brought with even the appearance of reason, against the associations of the friends of peace. The assertion, that their labors are useless, that they cannot contribute materially to the accomplishment of their object, is one of that class of discouraging predictions, much easier made than shown to be probable, and which, if believed in, would put an end to all exertion for the good of mankind. In our opinion, the very fact that such societies have been established, has done good. The few voices already raised against the custom of war, have been heard far and wide, and not heard in vain. The publications of the Peace Societies may have reached comparatively few; but the fact, that an attempt is making to free the earth from one of its most appalling evils, has become known and appreciated by thousands. That they can accomplish the immediate abandonment of war, is impossible; that their efforts will coöperate powerfully with the other causes now at work, under God's providence, in diminishing its horrors, and gradually banishing it from the world, is not only possible, but probable, — we had almost said certain. God speed them in their noble work!

The associated friends of peace have directed their attention to devising a plan for settling, without recourse to arms, those controversies between nations, which now too frequently terminate in war. Their favorite idea is, that of a council, composed of delegates from all civilized nations, to whom such disputes should be referred. We think they have been unfortunate in their choice of a remedy, and that a more simple and practicable plan, more consistent with the liberty of the respective nations, and with the general interests of the world, may be adopted; — nay, that it is even now, in many cases, acted on, and only requires some few and simple regulations, to render it of general utility. We refer to the employment of

arbitration, or mediation, by some power friendly to both contending parties.

Our objections to the establishment of a Congress of Nations are, that it must either be inefficient for the objects it is designed to accomplish, or, if armed with power to carry its decrees into effect, that its organization will be inconsistent with the independence of the respective states, with the progress of liberty, and even with the permanent establishment of peace itself.

Unless armed with power, such a tribunal must be inefficient. If it is a congress of sovereigns, or of ambassadors, authorized to act in all cases, if it has troops directly at its own disposal, or if it may call on one or more of its supporters for military assistance, its decisions may, for a time at least, meet submission. Were it even invested with a high degree of that moral power, that influence over public opinion, which marks the movements of a nation, it might be authoritative. A congress of sovereigns and plenipotentiaries would command respect, even if it were certain their decisions never would be enforced by arms. It is on this principle, of the factitious dignity of the judge, that arbitration rests. Any man, of common sense, could have decided the late question between the United States and France, as well as the king or the prime minister of England; and would, practically, have had equal power to enforce his decision; for the British nation never would sanction a war to give effect to a mediation. Why, then, did the parties respect the intervention of England? Because the mediator was one whose aid it was not beneath their dignity to accept; it was not the king personally, nor his ministers, nor his ambassadors; it was England, mighty England, who offered herself as a common friend. But a congress, or a court, of mere private individuals, not representing their respective nations, because not authorized to act for those nations, or bind them in support of their decisions, — a court, simply, to judge such cases as should be brought before it, and without power to do more than recommend its determinations to the contending parties, — the world is not yet wise enough to submit to the decrees of such a board of respectable private gentlemen, the only tribunal on earth possessed of no physical power, unless, indeed, we make an exception in favor of the Ecclesiastical Councils of Massachusetts.

But if such a tribunal were, for any length of time, submitted

to, it would soon acquire physical power. If it were a court of private individuals at first, it would be a very different body at the end of ten years. The fiend of ambition is not laid yet. Pretexts would not be wanting, upon which this court of nations might found a claim to control the armies and navies of its mighty constituents. In the very first instance in which such a court should decide against powerful injustice, if its decision was not obeyed, would not all the better feelings of humanity prompt the nations to carry that decision into effect, at the sword's point? This they might properly do, of their own sovereign choice; but if it were to uphold the decision of the grand tribunal of arbitration, that moment they would establish a sovereignty over themselves. The support, voluntarily given at first, would afterwards be requested; and if such requests were long complied with, it would soon be demanded as a matter of established right. Then let any nation disobey the mandates of the supreme Tribunal, and the standing armies of all the neighboring powers would be put in motion, to reduce it into order, under the specious pretext of maintaining the peace of the world. Will it be said, that the nations would know their own true interests better? We believe it, indeed, and the result we have already pointed out, in the entire inefficiency of the proposed tribunal; but if it were efficient, if its decrees were submitted to, it must be by a relinquishment of independence on the part of the different states.

And let no one suppose, that this relinquishment would only extend to the right of making war. If the Tribunal had acquired the right of forcibly suppressing wars between the members of the great republic of nations, it would soon claim that of allaying intestine disturbances in the respective states. Civil wars are not less fierce than foreign; and the benevolence of the great council would surely interpose, to stop the effusion of blood; nor could this be done in any way so effectually, as by the presence of an overwhelming force. Now, though we would that the progress of reform could always be gradual and tranquil, we yet hold to the faith of our ancestors, that, when evils become insufferable, a revolution is necessary, though it may be accompanied with bloodshed. We believe, too, that, if foreign powers undertake, by force, to oppose the struggles of a people resolved on freedom, all they can effect will be to continue the contest for ages, with immense slaughter, while, otherwise, it might have been briefly and happily ended.

"For Freedom's battle, once begun,
Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
Though baffled oft, is ever won."

We should then, regard, as an event of sad omen, the intervention of this Council of the world, to maintain the peace of Germany or Italy, against the efforts of the people themselves.

It will be seen, that, if the above remarks are just, the establishment of such a council would not even secure the object for which it is proposed, that of peace. We cannot believe that the whole world would submit tamely to its sway; — then, indeed, there would be peace, the dead tranquillity of despotism. The new principle of preserving peace will be like the old idea of the balance of power, — a shadow, to secure which, nations, in former days, squandered the substantial means of greatness and independence. The balance of power, and the blessing of peace, are alike best secured, not by arbitrary arrangements for the purpose, but by a just, friendly, yet dignified and independent course pursued by each nation towards the rest.

But the experiment of an International Tribunal is not altogether untried. The history of the world presents, at least, two instances of something approaching to that which has been recently proposed. The earlier of these may be found in the power claimed and exercised by the Popes, in the middle ages, to exercise control over sovereigns; and a more striking instance can hardly be imagined, to illustrate both the inefficiency of such a tribunal for the preservation of peace, and the danger resulting from it to the liberties of the respective states. Concessions were made to this great spiritual power, by the different monarchs, or extorted from them, deeply compromising their personal and political independence; and yet, if two of these same princes were engaged in war, and the supreme Pontiff interfered in the truly Christian character of a peace-maker, his voice, powerful as it was at other times, was unheeded amid the din of arms. Another instance, and still more in point, is furnished by the self-styled "Holy Alliance" of European sovereigns, organized with especial reference to the preservation of peace, and proving, in the end, a combination to put down every effort, which should be made by any of the nations, for the recovery or defence of their liberty. We have no desire, with these examples before us, to see the experiment of an international tribunal again repeated.

It is well, in all projected improvements, to study the course

of nature, and to identify with that, as far as possible, the efforts of our own art. The engineer would be regarded as mad, who should endeavor to construct a rail-road across some precipitous mountain, when a level route through broad valleys lay invitingly before him. And the philanthropist, in devising remedies for the evils of his day, will do well to watch the tendencies of society, and conform his plans to them, assuring himself that he will thus accomplish his object in the speediest and best manner. Such a course, in reference to the evils of war, is that indicated by the disposition of governments, in modern times, to refer subjects of dissension between them, to neutral powers, as arbiters or mediators. What reason can be assigned, why this mode of settling disputes, instead of being occasionally resorted to, if perchance one of the parties should desire it, should not be recognised by the common consent of nations, as in every case obligatory upon them? Let it be considered indispensable, before a state resorts to the law of force, that this mode of peaceably deciding every question be resorted to. And since nations, like individuals, are little disposed for peaceful measures, at the moment when they consider their rights as invaded, let advantage be taken of the period of peace, to prepare for that of hostile feeling. Why should not a section be inserted in all the treaties of our country with foreign powers, providing that, in case of future difficulties between the high contracting parties, neither nation shall have recourse to arms, until the methods of arbitration and mediation shall both have been tried and have failed? Were our country to set this glorious example, would not other powers soon perceive the reasonableness, the safety, the humanity, and the dignity of a similar course? Soon would our conduct be imitated, and a most powerful security given to the peace of the world.

But whether such decided steps are taken by our country, or not, we have the satisfaction of believing, that the public opinion of the world at large will soon enforce the general adoption of this principle. A war now is not, as in former days, an affair only of the two nations engaged in it. It affects others also, commercially and politically. France cannot blockade Mexico, but that English and American merchants share in the suffering. The peace of all becomes, therefore, the interest of all. The voice of interest, then, will be listened to; and not that voice alone. There is a more generous spirit arising in the world; the traces are disappearing of that political bigotry,

which, of old, made foreigner and enemy synonymous terms. The divine law of love is beginning to be applied to public, as well as private morals. We trace, in these things, the hand of Providence, and rejoicing to observe, and endeavoring humbly to coöperate with its movements, we commit to it, with cheerful confidence, the destiny of a world, for which, in its own good time, it is preparing the blessing of permanent and universal peace.

Since writing the above remarks, we have been favored with the perusal of the Report, presented to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Legaré of South Carolina, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The subject of the report was a memorial, from the New York Peace Society and others, desiring the government to exert its influence for the establishment of a Congress of Nations, authorized to promulgate a code of public law. The opinion of the committee is the same which has been presented in these pages, sustained by forcible arguments and historical illustrations. It is shown, with great distinctness, that the proposal could not, at present, receive universal consent; — that if it were, however, adopted, and any respect paid to the decisions of the new international tribunal, more harm than good would probably result from it. The instance of the Amphictyonic Council, in ancient Greece, which had been adduced by the memorialists, in favor of their views, is itself brought forward as a warning against them; — since that body, which possessed little or no efficiency in preserving peace, while the power of the states was equally balanced, became, at a later period, an instrument in the hands of Philip, to aid his ambitious designs.

The Report thus concludes:

"Your Committee, therefore, do not think the establishment of a permanent international tribunal, under the present circumstances of the world, at all desirable; but they heartily concur with the memorialists, in recommending a reference to a third power of all such controversies, as can safely be confided to any tribunal unknown to the constitution of our own country. Such a practice will be followed by other powers, already inclined, as we have seen, to avoid war, and will soon grow up into the customary law of civilized nations. They conclude, therefore, by recommending to the memorialists to persevere in exerting whatever influence they may possess over public opinion, to dispose it habitually to the accommodation of national differ-

ences without bloodshed; and to the House the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject referred to them."

While the sentiments expressed in this report are prevalent among our rulers, we have no cause to fear that our present peaceful relations with the world will soon be disturbed. One suggestion only would we wish to see added to those of the enlightened committee, — that our nation, now in the enjoyment of peace with all mankind, should improve the present opportunity to make arrangements, by treaty, with all other civilized powers, for the employment of arbiters or mediators, upon any difficulty which may, in future, arise, before resort shall be had, by either party, to those warlike measures, which can only be justified when no other means remain for maintaining national security and honor.

ART. IV. — 1. *The Life of William Wilberforce.* By his sons, ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, M. A., Vicar of East Farleigh, and SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, M. A., Rector of Brighstone. In five volumes. London. 1838.

2. *Strictures on a Life of William Wilberforce, by Rev. R. I. Wilberforce, and Rev. S. Wilberforce.* By THOMAS CLARKSON, M. A. London. 1838. pp. 136.

FROM the title of this latter work by that venerable philanthropist Thomas Clarkson, our readers will at once infer, that the copious memoir of Mr. Wilberforce by his sons has not passed without censure. And from the significant motto adopted by Mr. Clarkson, in his title page, "Neque premendo alium me extulisse velim," may as easily be inferred the nature of the complaint, which, with much reason and equal reluctance, he has been compelled to urge against the children of his ancient friend. The first sentences of his work convey, in simple and touching expressions, the feelings which constrained his publication:

"I did not expect, in the seventy-ninth year of my age, to be

called upon to defend the correctness of any part of my 'History of the Abolition of the Slave Trade,' published thirty years ago, against any one, and least of all against two of the sons of my late revered friend, Mr. Wilberforce. My history was in his hands for twenty-five years before his death, and he, who was well acquainted with all the material facts recorded in it as they occurred, never himself intimated that it contained any misstatements. The charges made against me, in the 'Life,' resolve themselves substantially into this one, that I have claimed for myself an honor, due to Mr. Wilberforce alone, in suggesting or executing the measures, which led to the successful result of that great undertaking, — the Abolition of the Slave Trade." — *Strictures*, p. 1.

That this charge was unfounded, and that the sons of Mr. Wilberforce, in a natural partiality, but certainly a mistaken zeal for the fame of their father, have treated injuriously his fellow-laborer, seems to us clearly proved; and believing, that in his various philanthropic labors, continued through a long life, amidst many perplexities and obstacles, Mr. Clarkson was in an eminent degree single-minded and disinterested, it is not certainly to the credit of these brothers, that they have compelled him in his old age, on the very verge of four-score, to refute an accusation so seriously affecting his reputation. For, next to the grossest hypocrisy, making prayers and confessions to be heard of men, is the converting a professed labor of benevolence into a selfish struggle for fame; and it has been by some disgusting minglings of this sort, that the sacred cause of charity itself has too often been dishonored.

Believing, then, that the friends of Mr. Clarkson, whom his many virtues, and a long exemplary life, have made not few, in this as well as in his native country, cannot but sympathize with him in the injury, of which he meekly complains, we turn to the book which has been the occasion of it. And here it is curious to remark the diversity of opinions pronounced of this Memoir, and the distinguished subject of it, according as political or religious biases have prevailed in shaping the judgment. The impartial reader may weigh them all; and he will find ample scope for reflection in the volumes themselves. For in addition to the unavoidable partiality of filial affection, in this instance easily exalted to reverence, the compilers — they are not to be called authors — have thrown together, with surprising carelessness, a mass of materials, drawn from the

diaries, correspondence, and loose papers of all sorts, left by their father, much of which he could never have thought of presenting to any eyes but his own; recording, with a dash of his pen, the warm emotions of one who, though singularly upright and pure, was as singularly a creature of impulse, and revealing, therefore, as might be anticipated, a various and not always consistent view of his character. To these sources of error must be added that tendency to coloring and exaggeration, so common and so fatal in biography; and which it would be surprising indeed if these affectionate sons had entirely resisted.

But we hasten to the Memoir. It is of one, whose name, beyond that of most men who have been numbered with the great, is familiar to the Christian world. For nearly half a century it has been identified with the cause of religion and humanity, and the best interests of mankind. The history of Mr. Wilberforce is remarkable as the history of an individual, who, under a monarchy where hereditary rank or public station is usually essential to a wide influence, impressed himself upon his age; and, with no higher official distinction than that of a Member of the British House of Commons — a distinction honorable, it is true, and not without power, but shared by more than six hundred individuals — accomplished one of the most important moral changes recorded in the history of the times.

At the same time, Wilberforce enjoyed some signal advantages for the career which he so long and honorably pursued. He was the descendant of an ancient house, who, from the time of Henry the Second, were distinguished among the gentry, though not nobles, of Yorkshire. The township of Wilberfoss, as it was formerly called, in which his family lived for several generations, gave him his mansion and his name, and he entered upon life under all those advantages, — every one of which is appreciated to the full in England, — that come from ancient descent, from hereditary wealth, from early indications of genius, aided by a generous system of education, from early and intimate friendships with the great, and from natural dispositions remarkably fitted to conciliate personal affection and even tender love.

"Of his earlier years," say his sons, "little is recorded. His frame from infancy was feeble, his stature small, his eyes weak, a failing which, with many natural endowments, he in-

herited from his mother. It was one among the many expressions of his gratitude, in after life, that he was not born in less civilized times, when it would have been thought impossible to rear so delicate a child. But with these bodily infirmities were united a vigorous mind, and a temper eminently affectionate. 'I shall never forget,' said a frequent guest at his mother's, 'how he would steal into my sick room, taking off his shoes lest he should disturb me, and, with an anxious face, looking through my curtains to learn if I was better.'"

At seven years old, he was sent to the Grammar School of Hull, of which Joseph Milner, the author of a singular Church History, was master. Hence, we presume, the origin of that friendship with Isaac, the brother of Joseph, afterwards Dean of Carlisle, and master of Queen's, Cambridge, which exerted upon the mind of young Wilberforce a very important religious influence. Of his near family connexions was the celebrated John Thornton, who took great delight in his young nephew; and an incident is related as forming a striking feature in his character in after life, that, on one occasion, his liberal uncle, with whom he was travelling, made him a present much exceeding the usual amount of a boy's possessions, with an intimation that "some good part of it should be given to the poor." It is not less useful than pleasant to mark the circumstances, apparently trivial, by which in early life, the traits of character, that are to distinguish the individual, are formed.

Both at school and at Cambridge University, which he entered at seventeen, the youth gave clear indication of the man. By the death of his father, in 1768, and soon afterwards of his grandfather, and of his uncle, to whose care he had been committed, he became the master of an independent fortune, under his mother's sole guardianship. While yet a child, his elocution was so remarkable, that his master used to lift him upon a table, and make him read aloud to the other boys as an example. This was the young voice, that, by its clear, musical, persuasive tones, was afterwards to instruct and charm in St. Stephens, and to hold a vast Yorkshire multitude, as we shall hereafter see, at his word. It was astonishing at what distances, without much apparent effort, but only by the distinctness and clearness of his utterance, Mr. Wilberforce could be heard.

The same social qualities, by which he became an universal favorite, marked his college life. At first he fell into dissi-

pated society, which he soon, however, abandoned as not congenial to his taste. For his last two years at Cambridge, he was the centre and the charm of a better circle. "There was nobody like him," writes his friend Rev. T. Gisborne, "for powers of entertainment. Always fond of repartee and discussion, he seemed entirely free from vanity and conceit." Money, of which he had a free command, he spent, as he spent it ever after, till he lost his fortune, in a frank, generous hospitality, in breakfasts, dinners, and other ways of making those around him happy. "There was always a great Yorkshire pie in Wilberforce's rooms," says a college friend, "and all were welcome to partake of it." We think we can almost see him, —his little form not bent, as in his old age, but graceful as it was delicate, his countenance bright with intelligence and kindness, —inviting to his bountiful but not luxurious cheer, and not discouraged by the liberties that were taken with it.

His religious character, while a youth, was not decidedly formed. His Yorkshire connexions, people, for the most part, of wealth and fashion, partook, in their modes of life, of the freedom of the times. And young Wilberforce, whose gayety of heart and social dispositions made him nothing loth, was their constant and welcome guest. "Hull was then," says he, in some notices of his early life, "as gay a place as could be found out of London. The theatre, balls, great suppers, and card parties, were the delight of the principal families of the town. The usual dinner hour was at two, and *at six they met at sumptuous suppers.* This mode of life was at first distressing to me, but by degrees I acquired a relish for it, and became as thoughtless as the rest. As grandson to one of the principal inhabitants, I was everywhere invited and caressed. My voice and love of music made me still more acceptable."

From an aunt, who was a great admirer of Whitefield, and kept up a friendly intercourse with the earlier Methodists, he had imbibed when a boy some religious impressions, which his mother, a woman of vigorous understanding and a highly cultivated mind, but as he describes her, "an Arch-bishop Tillotson Christian," (would that all were such,) was fearful would prove injurious. Some of his other friends spared no pains to stifle them, and "no pious parent," writes he, "ever labored more to impress a beloved child with sentiments of piety, than they did to give me a taste for the world and its diversions." These

efforts, it must be acknowledged, were for a time successful. At college he lived much in the society of the Fellows, who complimented him for his abilities, but encouraged his dissipation. "Why in the world should a man of your fortune trouble himself with all this fagging," was the language of their friendship. In London,—that great theatre of wisdom and folly, of all vice and of all goodness,—he soon became intimate with the Duke of Norfolk, (of whom, at his very first meeting, he won at cards twenty-five guineas!) with Pitt, then like himself a very young man, and Fox, with other kindred spirits. At Brookes's, which was one of the five clubs to which he belonged, he for the first time "joined from mere shyness at the Faro table," and a brief diary of this period records more than once the loss of a hundred pounds.

The vice of gaming seems, indeed, to have exerted for a short time its usual fascination even upon the mind of Wilberforce. But he was rescued from it by the natural kindness of his heart. On one occasion, he rose the winner of no less a sum than six hundred pounds. Much of this was lost by young men who were only heirs to future fortunes; and who could not, therefore, meet such a call without inconvenience. The pain he felt at their annoyance cured him of a taste, which seemed but too likely to become predominant.

But great as were the temptations that surrounded him, he appears to have yielded to no gross indulgences. Lord Clarendon, his intimate friend at college and through life, thus describes him: "He had never in the smallest degree a dissolute character, however short his early habits might be of that constant piety and strictness, which were soon perfected in his happy disposition." And in recurring in after life to this commencement of his career, he says, with the honesty that was as conspicuous in him as his humility, that "though he could not look back upon this period without unfeigned remorse, yet he had rather to deplore neglected opportunities of moral and intellectual improvement, than vicious practices or abandoned principles."

Even while he was a student at the University, he resolved to engage in public life. He had inherited from his grandfather a large commercial establishment at Hull, which during his minority had been managed for him by his cousin, Mr. Smith. But his ample fortune from this and other sources, and a taste for intellectual pursuits, gave a different direction to his thoughts;

and, declining any cares of business, he offered himself as a candidate for the representation of his native town in Parliament. This was in 1780, when he had hardly attained the age of freedom. Every circumstance connected with the beginnings of greatness can hardly fail of awakening interest, and therefore it is pleasant to relate one or two incidents of this beardless statesman, which he himself, with the gayety that even old age could not quench, was fond of relating. "When I first canvassed the town, there lived at Hull a fine athletic fellow, a butcher, named John, or, as they used to call him, Johnny Bell. I rather shrunk from shaking hands with him, saying to one of my staunch supporters, that I thought it going rather too low for votes. 'O sir,' was his reply, 'he is a fine fellow, if you come to bruising.' The day following the election, this butcher came to me privately and said, 'I have found out who threw the stone at you, and I'll kill him to-night.' The threat was seriously intended, and I was forced to suppress his zeal by suggesting that it would be too severe a punishment for what had proved, after all, a harmless attempt; adding 'you must only frighten him.' ".

The incident is of use not merely as belonging to the history of Wilberforce, but as illustrating the coarse and barbarous manners of some of the lower classes of England only fifty years since, and the weapons of warfare employed in their popular elections. Great changes have since been wrought, partly through the influence of Sunday Schools, in the morals and habits of the working classes in Great Britain, and assuredly there was room and need, for nothing is more revolting than the profligacy and brutal violence, which marked their festivities and political struggles even many years after this period.

Another incident, less disagreeable, but showing the manners of the times, and recording one of the many abuses, which have since been the subject of reform, is gathered from this narrative. After a successful canvass on the spot, he repaired to London, where about three hundred freemen resided in the vicinity of the river, probably as boatmen, coal-heavers, &c., all of whom he entertained at suppers in the different public houses of Wapping; *and by his addresses to them first gained confidence in public speaking.* His success in his first attempts was no insignificant token of the brilliancy of his future course. The election cost him, it is true, between eight and nine thousand pounds; but he was returned as

representative of Hull by a very flattering majority, and thus commenced a career which for more than forty years he pursued with so much disinterestedness and usefulness and honor.

But his native place was not permitted long to appropriate him. Whatever pride its people may have felt in the opening character and fame of their youthful representative, they were soon called to resign him to a wider and more appropriate sphere. In May, 1784, after a severe contest, in which his friends had to contend against the mighty influence and boundless wealth of the Whig nobility, the Devonshires, the Fitzwilliams, and others, leading men of the county, Mr. Wilberforce took his seat as member for Yorkshire. The result of an election, so powerfully contested, and in all previous cases so enormously expensive as to require nothing less than the revenues of princes, astonished every one but himself. But kindling with "that internal consciousness of power, by which great men are prepared for high attempts, he had secretly presaged the actual issue." The intrepidity and eloquence he exhibited, and all the measures he pursued, were worthy of the occasion and of his signal success. No wonder that he has recorded it in his Diary as among the most eventful passages of his life. Having hastened from London to Yorkshire, secretly determined to take at once the head of the party, he reached York the evening before the election. Of the next day he thus writes: "March 25. Up early — at York tavern; cold hailing day. Castle Yard meeting from ten to half past four. Messenger came to me there." This was an express from Mr. Pitt in London, announcing to him important intelligence touching the business of the day. "The great men all drove up in their coaches and six; an immense body of free-holdiery present. The distinguished men of both sides had been heard, of whom, and among his opponents, were the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Carlisle, Lords Cavendish and Fitzwilliam. The day was far advanced and the listeners were growing weary of the contest. At length, — we take the words of his biographers, —

"Mr. Wilberforce mounted the table, from which under a great wooden canopy the various speakers had addressed the meeting. The weather was so bad, that it seemed as if his slight frame would be unable to make head against its violence. The castle yard, too, was so crowded, that men of the greatest physical powers had been scarcely audible. Yet such was the

magic of his voice and the grace of his expression, that by his very first sentence he arrested, and for above an hour he enchained the attention of the surrounding multitude. 'Danby tells me,' writes a friend to him, 'that you spoke like an angel; and that I hear from many others.' The disadvantage of his slight form was forgotten in the force and animation of his eloquence. 'It is impossible,' says another who heard him, 'to forget his speech, or the effect which it produced.' 'I saw,' says Boswell, writing to Dundas, afterwards the too celebrated Lord Melville, 'what seemed a mere shrimp mount the table, but as I listened he grew and grew, until the shrimp became a whale.'"

Thus, before he had reached the age of twenty-five, Mr. Wilberforce attained the highest public station which he ever sought, or could be prevailed on to accept. Others, with less wealth and incomparably less power, have been rewarded with the honors of nobility or high and lucrative places. But from the first he determined to maintain his independence, and till his retirement from Parliament, which was in 1825, presented the very rare example of one, who, without joining himself absolutely to any party, preserved the respect and confidence of all. His early predilections and most of his intimacies were with the Tories, or the supporters of the Crown, by whom he was brought into office. His bosom friend was that Prince of tories and conservative statesmen, William Pitt. But this never prevented Mr. Wilberforce from giving his vote for or against the Ministry, as his judgment or his conscience dictated. And though he could not escape the trials, and sometimes had to endure the humiliations, which any man or angel pursuing such a course must inevitably suffer, he still maintained his integrity. His position, however, was at times exceedingly difficult, and needed all his firmness to sustain him. "When I went to the Levee," he writes, on one occasion, after he had been opposing some measures of the crown, "the King cut me." And again, "The Speaker's great dinner; all the *old firm* present. I not there." These and things like them, "the cold shoulder" of royalty, or the not being bidden to the Speaker's dinners, Wilberforce could bear. But it grieved his affectionate heart when his friend Pitt, fearing or suspecting his opposition, cast upon him his enquiring, withering glance, as he rose in his seat to speak; and it is evident how much he suffered, when the friendship which was so sincerely cherished, was exchanged, for a short season of unusual political struggle, to

coldness. But this is the hard lot of politicians, and of all who take counsel of their consciences rather than of their party. With men of inferior gifts, or inferior moral power, the standing aloof from party is usually at the serious hazard of their influence. There are few, indeed, who, on the great questions either of religion or government most keenly agitated amongst men, choose to act by themselves, but are made to see by some humbling method, how easily the rest of the world can go on without them. Wilberforce was of the chosen few. His personal worth, his persuasive eloquence, his insinuating address, his shrewd discernment, and the exquisite sweetness of his temper, carried him successfully through conflicts with himself and his friends, which have been fatal to many. He was in truth too rich a prize for all parties to be lightly lost hold of, even for a moment, by that which claimed him for its own. Not seldom did he disappoint, and even incense his friends by joining their opponents. But they knew his integrity, and they knew also his wisdom. If his course was glorious, so also it must not be forgotten were his gifts. But it is not every man who may choose to follow the example, that may hope for a like triumph.

We of this age think of Mr. Wilberforce chiefly as the eloquent orator in the House of Commons, as the founder and munificent patron of charities, as the bold and uncompromising enemy of slavery, as the generous liberator of Africa, as the pious and exemplary Christian. And these are the honored names he bears, and by which he will not cease to be known, as long as genius and virtue and philanthropy have a place in the world. But we love to dwell also on his youth. And never was there a more laughter-loving, more mirth-making creature than he; the very life of every circle he entered, whether at college or at court, and sure to delight by his joyous countenance, his wit, and his playful, but invariably gentle and benevolent ways. Who would have dreamt that when a young man he "was an admirable mimic, and, until reclaimed by the kind severity of the old Lord Camden, would often set the table in a roar by his perfect imitation of Lord North." His accomplishments in singing, too, were such as are seldom possessed without some hazard. "Wilberforce, we must have you again; the Prince (afterwards that profligate monarch George the Fourth) says he will come at any time to hear you sing," was the flattery which he received after his first meeting with

the Prince of Wales, in 1782, at the luxurious soirées of Devonshire-house.

We cannot therefore wonder, that his biographers represent this as the most critical period of his course. For when we consider the temptations besetting a young man of wealth and powerful connexions, with strong social propensities, a keen taste moreover for the ludicrous, and a gift at mimicry, it is easy to see that, in such a society as that of the wits of London, he was exposed to no small temptation. He himself, in a letter addressed some years after to an early friend, refers to it with expressions of remorse and fervent gratitude to the Providence that rescued him. And he had reason for such thankfulness; for though as he himself declares "he was far enough from being licentious, and was rather complimented on being better than young men in general," yet it must have been difficult to a young man, courted as he was, and a member at the same time of five London clubs, to escape wholly the contagion of such society. His journal at this period, which his sons have transcribed with a strange want of judgment, contains, with some brief and unsatisfactory allusions to public affairs, notices like these:

"Oct. 25th. To London, about one o'clock in the morning. Supped at Goostree's, bed half past three.

"28th. Kemble, Hamlet, and Goostree's.

"Nov. 1st. Pitt and Eliot came in at four; dined and slept. Pitt stayed all day.

"Nov. 8th. Eliot and Pitt came to dinner, and all night.

"28th. Dined Tom Pitt's; Mrs. Crewe — charming woman.

"29th. Went to see Mrs. Siddons — Mrs. Crewe at play.

"30th. Dined Lord Chatham's; — House: — wrote for ladies to go to the gallery, but disappointed."

At another time he writes,

"31st. Pitt resigned to-day. Dined Pitt's, — then Goostree's (Hotel), — there supped. Bed almost three o'clock."

And this, and a later, was no unusual hour for his repose. Through his life Wilberforce loved *sitting up*, — a habit unavoidable to a faithful member of Parliament during the sessions, but suiting also his social turn, which found no season so congenial to its indulgence, and no conversation so animated as that, which comes with midnight.

To his intimacy with Pitt, and the leading statesmen of the day, we have already adverted. It seems to have been at this period particularly close. They could occasionally take freedoms with his innocent peculiarities, but he was always a great favorite with them, an object of real affection as well as respect; and they were not slow, particularly Mr. Pitt, who was a bachelor, to avail themselves of his easy good-natured hospitality, a grace in which Mr. Wilberforce delighted, but which, with the natural facility of his temper, general habits of carelessness, and a boundless charity, issued at last in the ruin of his ample fortunes. The following note from Mr. Pitt shows the easy footing on which they lived, and the articles prescribed for the treat, (always expensive in a London market,) to which he and his friends invited themselves, mark their confidence in the generosity of their host:

"Eliot, Arden, and I will be with you before curfew, and expect an early meal of peas and strawberries. W. PITT.
House of Commons, half past four."

But we turn to another, and a far more important view of the character of this excellent man. It is as a Christian and a philanthropist that Mr. Wilberforce will be regarded long after the conflicting political interests, in which he warmly engaged, shall have ceased, and when even those great objects of benevolence, to which beyond all others he devoted himself, shall have been fully accomplished. Though in that gayest period of his life, of which we have spoken, he never seems to have fallen into gross excesses, — one instance, perhaps, must be excepted, in which he appears to have been a witness or a partner at a Faro table on a Sunday, — yet to his joyous nature there were attractions in a life of fashion and dissipation, such as could be overcome by nothing but a stronger religious influence. That influence was soon to be experienced. And without entering into all the particulars of time and circumstances, on which his biographers dwell, it belongs to his history to state, that a friendship formed when he was about twenty-five years of age with Dr. Isaac Milner, (afterwards by his recommendation to the Prime Minister made Dean of Carlisle,) was the occasion of a decided change in his sentiments, and of awakening that absorbing interest in religious truth, that deep solicitude for his own spiritual welfare and that of all mankind, which was ever afterwards the controlling principle of his life.

In the character of Dr. Milner, thus distinguished in this memoir as the spiritual counsellor of Mr. Wilberforce, we cannot avoid noticing something extraordinary; though the church, of which he was a warm disciple, and of whose rich endowments he shared, has never been without similar examples. His first decided influence on the mind of his young friend was exerted in the course of a journey of some months on the continent, in which by invitation of Mr. Wilberforce he became his travelling companion. Though a beneficed clergyman, and afterwards head of Queen's College, Cambridge, (the same which boasts of Erasmus among its eminent scholars,) he seems at this period to have "been in all respects like an ordinary man of the world; and when," says Mr. Wilberforce in his journal, "I first engaged him as a companion of my tour, I knew not that he had any deeper principles. *He never thought of reading prayers during our whole stay at Nice.* He mixed like myself in all companies, and *joined as readily as others in the prevalent Sunday parties.*" And again, "Though his religious principles were even now, in theory, much the same as in later life, yet they had at this time little practical effect upon his conduct." It is added, however, "that he was free from every taint of vice."

This addition, though of great importance, still leaves a somewhat singular account of the individual, who was to exert so decided a religious influence on a mind like that of Wilberforce. Dr. Milner, — as we remember his form, proudly conspicuous among the Heads of Colleges on an Easter Sunday in the University Church at Cambridge, — was of a most portly frame, somewhat lordly in its bearings, and altogether justifying to the outward eye the impression, that *his* spiritual struggles must be with constitutional indolence, and that he was in no wise indisposed to the innocent relaxations of the combination room, or of a table like that of Mr. Wilberforce. But with all this, a frame which he could not help, and tastes thence accruing which it doubtless would be his care to regulate, he united, in common with the more celebrated Dr. Johnson, a fervent, solemn, churchman-like sense of religion; counting nothing earthly quite so good as the excellent Liturgy of the Church of England; insisting zealously on the interpretation of its articles; and sincerely desirous, we doubt not, that all men might embrace them and be saved.

The first intimation Mr. Wilberforce received of the strong

religious convictions of his fellow-traveller was in a conversation on some work of Stillingfleet.* "I spoke of him as a good man, but one who carried things too far." "Not a bit too far," said Milner, and proceeded to insist on such strict views of religion, as surprised his friend, who adds, "had I known at first what his opinions were, it would have decided me against the offer."

But however unexpected, or even unwelcome, were the views thus enforced, they produced upon the susceptible mind of Mr. Wilberforce no ordinary or transient effect. They deeply impressed him at the time, and they remained with him through life. They led him gradually, however, and with no violence to his amiable temper, to separate from his gay associates, to withdraw from the clubs of which he had been a member; and their fruits afterwards appeared, in the daily study, faithfully pursued, of the Scriptures; in habits of strict self-examination and private devotion; in his serious attendance on public worship and observance of religious ordinances; and in the consecration of his eminent gifts, his ardent and honorable friendships, and the wide influence of his station to the promotion, in his own country and throughout the world, of Christian piety and charity. Henceforth, Mr. Wilberforce assumes the place, which for nearly half a century he so honorably filled as a *Christian statesman and philanthropist.* It was with these religious impressions, fresh in his heart, that he first, in 1785, took his place in the House of Commons as member for Yorkshire, and from this time, whatever his enemies might object to his politics or his creed, — however some might question his judgment or sneer at what they called his Methodism, — however Mr. Pitt, who really loved him, might have been provoked by his occasional going over to the opposition, or cursed in his heart the tenderness of conscience or unyielding integrity that deprived him of the vote of a county member, — however some may have ridiculed his projects for the reformation of manners, or even his charities, too numerous and generous to be in every instance cautiously bestowed, — however others may have laughed at his hospitalities, so wide and indiscriminate as

* Whether is intended here Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, the learned author of Origines Sacræ, and Bishop of Worcester in the reign of Charles the Second, or, as we rather infer, some later, more practical writer, does not appear.

to include princes and paupers, Yorkshire constituents at breakfast and crack-brained reformers boring him with their plans for hours after it,* strangers of every degree and complexion, Madam de Staël, Andrew Fuller, and our own colored Prince Saunders; — spiritsand bodies, white, black, and grey, — a hospitality, however, of which they who laughed at it were themselves but too happy to partake; — whatever, in fine, may have been objected to the circumstance, or form, or degree, in which his qualities may occasionally have been presented, — no one, we think, can be so prejudiced, as to deny to Mr. Wilberforce the character of a Christian indeed; of one, who "had the witness within himself;" whose "life was hidden with Christ in God," while it was employed with singular industry, fidelity, and disinterestedness in the service of his fellow men. It was, also, his distinguished praise, and this was reserved for his closing scene, that while the prosperity of a long public career

* The following extracts from his Diary, taken without selection, may show the nature of his occupations, and how freely he subjected his purse and his time to the disposal of others:

"1812. Dec. 7. Breakfasters numerous and not clear from company till time to go to British and Foreign Bible Society. Then House. At night home with the Dean.

"Dec. 8th. Fuller of Kettering breakfasted and talked much about East Indian Gospel communication plan. Then to Manufacturers' Committee. Duke of Kent in the chair, and very civil. Then Hatchard's — letters — home to dinner. Stephen, Simeon, the Dean (Milner) and others. 12th. Forced to dine with Duke of Gloucester.

"30th. Owen of Lanark breakfasted with me and staid long, talking of his plan of education, and of rendering manufactures and morals compatible." Again, "1815, April 1st. Spurzheim, the craniologist, here, and people talking about his system. May 3d. Anniversary of Bible Society. Robert Grant spoke beautifully. I, well received, but very moderate in real performance. 16th. Dr. Chalmers breakfasted with me. Inglis, old Symons, and others. Mr. H. rather bored me on the Catholic question. Callers in morning."

"1818. Mr. Storer and Everett, Americans, breakfasted. Latter Greek Professor in their Cambridge University, — has been two years travelling. One year and a half at Gottingen University. He told me much of the skepticism of the Professors, — sad work — long talk with him."

"1818. May 20th. General Boyd's committee — to receive his answer." And again, "July 4th. General Boyd this morning kept me above an hour."

This gentleman, an American, formerly of Boston, had a claim on the British government for indemnification, for which he sought the aid of Mr. Wilberforce.

did not impair his humility, neither did the adversity of his declining days diminish in the least his cheerful gratitude or his unshaken trust in God.

Of the many evidences we might select of his religious character, we will mention his *reverence of the Sabbath*, and his conscientious separation of its hours from the labors and duties of his political life. There was, however, no superstition or formality mingled with his observances. He yielded to the claims of necessity, or propriety, and had too much good sense to make his piety contemptible, by adhering scrupulously to a form at the sacrifice of a pressing duty. Accordingly, he complied with the invitation, which with sovereigns is equivalent to a command, to attend the Emperor of Russia when in London, on a Sunday; and embraced the opportunity to recommend to him some object of philanthropy. He once set off from London on a Sunday noon, in a carriage and four with outriders, for Yorkshire, whither he was summoned by an express, which he received as he was going to church, and his own carriage not being in readiness, he accepted the offer of Mr. Pitt's, who well knew the importance of his departure. He reached York in season,* and the exultation of his friends as his carriage dashed before all others into the scene of action, and the triumphant result amply justified the extraordinary efforts he made. This was the occasion on which Boswell speaks of his diminutive frame and surpassing eloquence; and it afterwards appeared, that but for his personal presence and influence his opponents would have been for the time successful.

But with those rare exceptions, to which public duty compelled him to submit, he was from inclination and habit a devout observer of the Sabbath. Its repose and peaceful influences were precious to him. He anticipated them all the week, and he welcomed them when they came. And so impressed was he with their value to the intellectual as well as to the spiritual well-being, to the mind not less than to the heart, that when Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Whitbread, broken down by public cares and the anxieties of political life, in the dark hour of mental alienation, put an end to their own existence†, he expressed once and again his conviction, — and it

* A distance of two hundred miles. Mr. Wilberforce travelled at this time two nights and a day without stopping, and drove immediately to the hustings.

† Lord Castlereagh in 1814; Mr. Whitbread in July, 1815.

is worthy of being remembered by all who like them are engrossed by official duties, — that had these busy statesmen only allowed themselves the respite, which Sunday affords, from their exhausting occupations, they might have maintained the tranquillity of their spirits. The repose, and religious employment of one day in seven would have availed, he thought, to restore the balance of their minds, and their country might have been spared the calamity, and their friends the anguish, and the world the example of their self-destruction.

The distinguishing trait in the character of Mr. Wilberforce was his benevolence, his generous and ardent philanthropy. In no view that we may take of him, can this quality be overlooked. Nor was it manifested in his public career alone, but in innumerable instances, great and small, in his private life. On his unremitting, and finally successful efforts for the Abolition of the Slave Trade we need not dwell. The world knows, how from 1789, when he first introduced it in the House of Commons, to 1807, when Mr. Fox, his powerful coadjutor, proposed the abolition of Slavery itself, he consecrated to this his chosen work his heart and life; not his eloquence alone, which on no other subject was so lofty and persuasive, but his indefatigable industry and a patience, which, though often tried, was never subdued. True it is, and it would be absurd in the partial friends of Mr. Wilberforce to deny, that he had through the whole of these twenty years the very pride and glory of England for his help; and the prayers and praises of thousands to cheer him on. In the House of Commons, there were Pitt and Fox, Burke* and Sheridan, Grant and Brougham, forgetting in this cause their political differences, and yielding him the mighty aid of their counsels and their eloquence. Without the House, there was, to mention no other, Mr. Thomas Clarkson, whose effective and inestimable services, as seen at the beginning of this article, it became not Mr. Wilberforce's sons to disparage, and which their father himself, were he living, would, we are confident, be eager to acknowledge.

But the highest efforts of Christian benevolence are not those of general philanthropy. To one conscious of power, and

* Mr. Burke was not long in Parliament after the subject of Slavery was introduced. But he was in heart with Mr. Wilberforce, and on one occasion pronounced a splendid eulogium on his friend for his subduing eloquence in this cause.

endued with eloquence, such objects open an inviting field of ambition; and there may be great zeal and noble speeches and even fatiguing efforts for suffering humanity, with a vast deal of selfishness and avarice at heart. Mr. Wilberforce, however, left no shadow of suspicion of this sort. His private charities were as remarkable as his public labors; and in truth they were profuse to an excess, and not always bestowed with sufficient caution. His benevolence was proverbial, and exposed him to all sorts of applications, by person and by letter, far and near, not for money alone, which he sometimes threw away, but for counsel and recommendation and personal influence. His house in London was thronged with visiters of this sort, and it is surprising, that, with his official cares and perpetual calls to public meetings, where he seldom failed of making a speech, he still suffered his time and his sympathies to be at the command of almost every beggar and schemer and fugitive that chose to call. "Every one that was in debt, and every one that was in distress, and every one that was discontented gathered themselves unto him."

Some of these applications must have been extremely embarrassing. What, for example, could this most amiable of philanthropists have done with a young lady, who in some difference with her father left her home with her maid, and flew to Mr. Wilberforce, on whom, as far as appears, she had no manner of claim, exclaiming, "Mr. Wilberforce, I have run away!" Hardly less troublesome must have been the visits of persons — and they were not few — having claims on government and soliciting his help, or petitions to Parliament for relief, or wild schemes for the conversion of India, or some other distant quarter of the earth.

Other applications there were of a distressing nature, which to his susceptible heart must have given the utmost pain. We quote one or two instances from his journal:

"1815. April. An affecting visit from Mrs. B., the wife of an attorney of respectable station and connexions at Leeds, convicted of forgery, and to be hanged this day week. Poor thing! I gave her no hopes; and wrote to his friend at Leeds to tell him plainly that no hope of pardon, &c." He adds, "I once visited a poor wretch, whom nothing would persuade, that he should not through his friends obtain a pardon, whereas I knew, about ten at night, that he was to be hanged the next morning."

At another date, "To town, to find out Dr. B. from Yarmouth,

who had written for twenty pounds, *without which he with his wife would be ruined* — could learn nothing — so sent it doubtingly."

No less a personage than Madame de Staël, who had been greatly charmed with his conversation while on her visit to London, became also in a great pecuniary emergency an object of his sympathy.

"1815. March. Madame de Staël was to have received in two or three days two million livres, when Blacas, who was to have acompanied her to the French minister, wrote to her, that, from imperious circumstances, all payments stopped. She for a few days lost her head, and drove about wildly. Soon afterwards she returned to Copet."*

On the private and domestic virtues of Mr. Wilberforce it would be delightful to dwell. He was one of the most amiable of men; cheerful to gayety in his temper, delighting in society, of which he was always the charm, and his laughter hearty and contagious, like a child's. As the manner, however, of too many gentlemen in England is, he lived a bachelor till a somewhat advanced period of life, not marrying till he was thirty-eight. In his conjugal connexion, the fruit of which was six children, he appears to have been eminently happy. He was no stranger, however, to the usual allotments of domestic bereavements; for he buried his two only daughters, and of his other children only three survive him. Of his sons, his biographers, we should not infer from the work before us, that they inherited much of their father's genius, or from their controversy with Mr. Clarkson — though their clerical profession might have taught them better — much of their father's spirit; which was, as we have seen, the kindest and most generous in the world.

Like all men of right feelings and tastes, Mr. Wilberforce

* This celebrated lady was often in company with Mr. Wilberforce while on her visit to London, and said to Sir James Mackintosh that he "was the best converser she had met with." But it is curious to remark Mr. Wilberforce's own diary after a dinner party at her house: "I must not go on thus. I am clear that it is right for me to withdraw from the gay and irreligious society of Madame de Staël and others." — Vol. iv. p. 166.

found his choicest satisfactions at home.* It is enough to say of him, that in all the relations of life, he was faithful to his principles, and what in him was ample security for everything, he was faithful to his own excellent heart. But the engagements of his too busy life, his constant attendance on Parliament, which he numbered with his indispensable duties, and the incessant hurry in which he permitted himself to a fault, public meetings, and frequent journeyings kept him so much from his family, that it was only, as he complained, "in his summer retirement, that he could get acquainted with his own children." Once, his infant child beginning to cry as he took him into his arms, the nurse apologized for the fears of the little one, saying, "he always is afraid of strangers."

Of the tenderness, however, of his parental affection, and of the habitual sweetness of his temper, we find a very pleasing incident related among some "Recollections of Mr. Wilberforce," by one who knew him well, and whose notices, though brief, are no less beautiful than affectionate. They have been ascribed to the pen of the Rev. Dr. Wilson, the present Bishop of Calcutta:

"A friend told me that he found him once in the greatest agitation, looking for a despatch, which he had mislaid. One of the royal family was waiting for it, — he had delayed the search to the last minute, — he seemed at last quite vexed and flurried. At this unlucky instant a disturbance in the nursery overhead occurred. My friend, who was with him, said to himself, 'Now, for once, Wilberforce's temper will give way.' He had hardly thought thus, when Mr. Wilberforce turned to him and said, 'What a blessing it is to have these dear children! Only think what a relief amidst other hurries to hear their voices, and to know that they are well.'"

As a master, Mr. Wilberforce was patient and indulgent even to excess. Assuredly he had need of these qualities in their perfection, to have borne with entire meekness a rebuke which was administered to him by one of his servants, while on a tour

* Mr. Wilberforce, at a dinner party, expressed great disgust at an unfortunate speech of an eminent personage, who speaking of domestic conversation, asked, "Who ever thinks of talking with his wife?" It was, doubtless, one of those speeches, which a wise man will not utter, but which are not to be maliciously interpreted.

with his family at the Lakes. It appears, that either in the attractions of that beautiful scenery, or in the pressure of affairs, from which not even Cumberland Lakes exempted him, he had quite forgotten some indispensable provision for his horses. Nor is he the only good man, who, in much talk and earnest zeal for humanity in general, has forgotten mercy to his beast. The speech of his coachman reminding his master of his duty will doubtless be thought by some as "worthy of the best days of the Commonwealth." It could scarcely have been more emphatic, had it been put into his mouth by Mr. Owen of Lanark, by Mrs. Frances Wright Darusmont, or any of the philanthropic levellers, male or female, of the present day. "Well, sir, and it's just like everything else; and you all of you for this whole journey have been so Lake-mad, and mountain-mad, and prospect-mad, that nothing has been thought of as it ought to have been"!!

The faults of Mr. Wilberforce's character, like the faults of most good men, grew out of his virtues; they were but virtues suffered to pass into excess. His friend, from whose interesting memoir we have just now quoted, calls them weaknesses rather than faults. "They were on the side," says he, "of hesitation, delay, indecision, discursiveness, and vagrancy of mind; the allowing himself to be imposed upon; disorder in his papers and correspondence; irregularity of hours; his study a perfect Babylon; his letters, thousands upon thousands heaped around; half a morning often lost (as in the instance just quoted) in recovering some important document. But all these," he adds, "were nothing; they flowed from his cast of character, and were perfectly understood and allowed for by all who knew him."

Now, whatever may be yielded to the partiality of friendship, we cannot admit with this writer that these faults were nothing. Though they were allied with engaging virtues, they were the sources of serious errors; they undeniably diminished Mr. Wilberforce's usefulness; interfered with his personal tranquillity and domestic enjoyment; and were the obvious causes of that calamity, which clouded his declining days.

One, who was indulgent as was Mr. Wilberforce in his judgments of others, is entitled to large charity for himself. But we can scarcely regard those failings as trivial which, in any of their consequences, near or remote, involved the loss of a landed property, estimated at ten thousand pounds per an-

num, and a total reverse in the condition of his family.* How far his charities, which were overflowing, or his hospitalities, which, though as we have understood simple, were boundless, — a table during the session of Parliament almost public, breakfastings and lunches perpetual,† — may have contributed, with his last unfortunate speculation, to the sad result, it is difficult to say. His charities partook of the excess, to which some other of his excellent qualities tended. It appears that he seldom disposed of less than one fourth part of his income, that he sometimes exceeded his income in this way; and that in one year particularly it was ascertained, that the sum of three thousand one hundred and seventy-three pounds (about fourteen thousand dollars) was thus spent. It is impossible to treat otherwise than kindly such "amiable indiscretions," as by one of his friends they are called. There was, moreover, such

---

* "The immediate cause of this disaster," says a writer in a contemporary English Journal, who betrays no unwillingness to magnify the mistakes of Mr. Wilberforce, "was a speculation in a ridiculous Milk Company, into which as was suspected his sons were duped." Whether this was a scheme for supplying the city of London on a large scale with pure milk, — a domestic article to which that great Metropolis is much a stranger, — or of whatever other nature, we cannot tell. The result at least was deplorable. It involved so great a loss, that Mr. Wilberforce was compelled to sell his largest estate in Yorkshire to meet it; and what must have been peculiarly painful to the feelings of such a father, had he lived to know it, "his eldest son, who would have been the heir, if not of his honors, yet of a large portion of his wealth, was compelled to relinquish the representation of the city of Hull, where his ancestors had lived in affluence and honor for nearly a century," (and where, we should add, his father himself commenced his public career and reaped youthful laurels,) for want of a qualification of three hundred pounds per year. — See *London Quarterly Review, for July*, 1838.

† It was one of Mr. Wilberforce's weaknesses, that he permitted himself to be imposed on by guests, as well as beggars of all descriptions. There was doubtless some gratification of vanity, from which his humility did not quite exempt him, in being sought to as the patron and counsellor, and "Member from Yorkshire," whose name was power. But he complains of the "excessive worry of his household from company of all sorts." Though his own family was not numerous, his establishment was large; and incredible was the multitude who in the course of a year sat at meat with him. "I prayed," says Mr. Martyn the missionary, in a letter to a friend, "in the midst of his large household, and breakfasted with a numerous company." We are told also by a friend, who took luncheon at his house, that he seemed to live in one continual hurry.

hearty benevolence, so much delicacy and considerateness in his bounty, (he urged upon Mrs. Hannah More the gift of a carriage and horses, because she was an invalid and needed daily exercise,) that Diogenes himself could hardly have condemned him. We are left only to regret, that fountains of so sweet a charity should have been exhausted; and that one, whose domestic affections quickened his compassion for others,* whose long life was one succession of bounties, should not have transmitted to his children the patrimony he had himself inherited. Yet, it was for the sake of these children, (causâ liberorum, as he writes in his journal,) that at the height of his prosperity and fame, he refused a Peerage, which was offered him by Mr. Pitt, fearing to injure his family by so costly an honor.

His reverses he bore with the cheerfulness and submission, which were alike the fruits of his amiable temper and practical faith. Some regrets and even self-reproach he could scarcely, we think, escape, if he looked distinctly at the undeniable causes of them; and he *did* confess, that it gave him pain to feel that he was no longer able to invite a friend to his table, or to a bed. This was indeed a mighty change in the habits of one to whose breakfast table, to say nothing of other hospitalities, the world was made welcome. But to the childlike spirit of Mr. Wilberforce all was right and all was kind in the perfect Providence of God. He was devoutly grateful for the rich mercies that still remained; and was as ready to draw spiritual benefit from the present adversity, as he had drawn copious enjoyment from his past prosperity. It is to be hoped, that his sons, as they were to partake largely of the trial, shared in their father's graceful submission to it. Through the unsolicited kindness of Lord Brougham, the then Lord Chancellor, the two younger sons, the editors of this work, had previously been favored with competent livings in the church, and within the bosom of their families, passing alternately (for he loved motion to the very last) from one parsonage to the other, Mr. Wilberforce spent the remainder of his days. Some decay of his intellectual faculties was observed by his oldest friends, but none

* Upon his payment of one of his large subscriptions to a public institution, he sets down in his Diary, "I subscribe to hospitals and dispensaries with increased good will, since I became a husband and a father."

whatever in that, which was his glory, his perfect temper and his all-sustaining faith. He died after a short sickness, and little bodily suffering, in July, 1833, in the seventy-fourth year of his age; and though his modesty had anticipated another disposition of his remains, he was buried, at the special request of Lord Brougham, and of many members of both houses of Parliament, who also requested permission as a token of personal respect to attend his funeral, in Westminster Abbey, close to the tombs of Pitt, and Canning, and Fox. And there in that vast repository of illustrious dead, within a briefer space than thirty years, from the time, that is, that Mr. Wilberforce accomplished his signal triumph in the House of Commons by the abolition of the Slave Trade, what multitudes — we cannot but pause to reflect — of those, who in that his darling enterprise acted with him or against him, have been gathered one after another to the same dark abode. How many eloquent tongues are there silenced in death! Political friends and foes, they who possessed and they who wanted place; Pitt, who loved Wilberforce, and the classical Windham, who never liked him; Fox, who helped him through all his struggles for the slave, but opposed him in most things else; Sheridan, who could ridicule his piety, but honored him in his heart as the eloquent friend of humanity; Whitbread, whom Mr. Wilberforce himself characterized as "that rugged but manly statesman," and thorough Englishman; the accomplished Canning; and his successful rival for the Premiership, to the cares of which reason and life were his costly sacrifice, Lord Castlereagh, — all these there lie down together. Also their love and their hatred and their envy have perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun.

To form a just estimate of Mr. Wilberforce, we must regard him in his religious rather than in his political character; as a Christian, and not as a statesman. His political influence, except on questions of morals or philanthropy, as the "Reformation of manners," and the Abolition of Slavery, was exceedingly limited. There are those, who deny that he had any weight in the House of Commons, except what was derived from his known religious character. His indecision, his ready surrender of himself to his own warm impulses, or to the views of others; his tender, but over-scrupulous conscience, sometimes bearing him to one extreme through nothing but fear of its

opposite; and above all, his excessive dread of party, making him jealous of his own friends, and blind to perceive how often it pleases God Almighty to make what men call party the minister of his own Providence, — were fatal to him as a statesman. It was religion that gave him power. And it is grateful to reflect, what power that alone did confer. It was the secret of his eloquence. Though the term was applied to him in derision, he was in an eminent sense the "religious member;" * and whatever might be thought of his speculations, however at times, and to answer a purpose, he might have been ridiculed as a Methodist, the House of Commons, and the whole nation with it, paid homage to the incontestable purity, piety, and blameless life of the man. Nor was he himself ignorant of his reputation in this regard. With his usual tenderness of conscience it prompted him to inquire what great duties it called him to perform, and these were not inconsiderable. On one occasion he resolved to seek an interview, on religious subjects, with the Prince Regent; and on another, he resolved, after reluctantly accepting her invitation to dinner, to avail himself of the opportunity to "speak a word in season to Madame de Staël." His good sense, however, and just reverence of the subject never failed to instruct him, that there was a time to keep silence as well as to speak, and he preferred, what it must be confessed he often encountered, the utter failure of his purpose, to an unseemly or ungracious forcing of an opportunity. He also thought that he was bound to talk as well and as agreeably as he could on other topics, that so he might give acceptance and weight to his religious conversation. How successfully he followed this excellent rule, and guarded his religious zeal from indiscretion, is evident from the delight with which his company was invariably welcomed. Even that selfish and profligate monarch, George the Fourth, repeatedly sent for him, and added to the message an assurance, that the topics of conversation should be of his own choosing. Madame de Staël, as we have seen, was proud of numbering him with her guests. On his part he justly deemed her spiritual con-

* When this epithet was once sneeringly used by an honorable member, Mr. Wilberforce was tempted to apply in return the opposite, and to answer the "irreligious member;" but with his customary gentleness he forbore.

dition susceptible of improvement. But that he knew well how to unite the "beauty of holiness" with his social graces, and honored his religion too much to render it disagreeable, is evident enough from the judgment pronounced on him by that brilliant lady; "I expected," said she, "to have found Mr. Wilberforce among the most religious; but I find also that he is among *the wittiest of men.*"

We cannot close a notice of Mr. Wilberforce without referring to the work, by which he is known as a writer. His "Practical View of the Prevailing Religious Systems, &c., contrasted with real Christianity," appeared in 1797, at a period when a treatise on such a subject by a layman and a statesman was of much rarer occurrence than at present, and when also, through the influence of the French Revolution and other causes, the tone of religion in the higher classes of society was extremely low. The first, and a large edition was with his customary munificence wholly appropriated by its author as gifts for his friends, and a copy was presented to every member of Parliament. It was followed within the same year by three other editions, and was widely circulated through the kingdom. Curiosity was awakened to see how a politician would treat of Christianity; and we believe, it was this book, which first obtained for him the designation of the "religious member." It had an undeniable influence in exciting attention to religion. Particularly within the Church of England it led to the formation of that party, since designated as the "Evangelical," of which, as distinguished from the "High Church," Bishop Porteus, John Newton, Cecil, Scott, Romaine, Simeon of Cambridge, Dean Milner, Hannah More, and Wilberforce himself were the conspicuous heads. It was for the promotion of the same views, and aided by their effective patronage and pens, that the well-known periodical, "*The Christian Observer,*" was commenced in January, 1803, and has ever since continued the organ of that numerous and influential body.

In this book, as in the Life of the writer, there are signal beauties united with signal defects. Mr. Wilberforce was not characterized by vigorous intellect; and his work, as were his speeches, is marked rather by earnestness of feeling, and an eloquence warm from the heart, than by any accuracy of method or closeness of argument. With what is peculiar in its theological views we need not here concern ourselves. We are not studious, in truth, to dwell on the faults either of the book or of

the man. Of the latter, which biographical truth requires us to admit, this at least may be said, that they were not of a nature, which the world in general are in danger of imitating. On the other hand, there are many, who will be ready enough to accept them for a warning; and to congratulate themselves that theirs is not a philanthropy or a charity so prodigal as to issue in ruin. Yet to our poor thoughts, the hoarding up of treasures, only to be wasted by speculating or profligate children, is scarcely to be preferred to the wasting of them in charity, which, though it may err in its excess, still does not lose the blessing.

And if there be those, and we believe there are some among our own countrymen, who having once partaken are ready to censure his boundless hospitality, it is for them to consider, that it was only through the very indiscriminateness of this hospitality they enjoyed the opportunity, which they were eager to embrace, and are still proud to remember, of seeing and conversing with Mr. Wilberforce. For our own part, we should seriously quarrel with ourselves for any willingness to scan severely the infirmities of one, whose heart was like his, a perennial fountain of kindness to man and thankfulness to God; of one, whose delight in the works, and gratitude for the gifts of his heavenly Father, were such as these: "He loved flowers with all the simple delight of childhood. And when he came in from his garden, carefully depositing a few that he had gathered, in his own room, he would say, as he enjoyed their fragrance, 'How good is God to us! What should we think of a friend, who had furnished us with a magnificent house, and all we needed, and then coming in to see that all had been provided according to his wishes, should be hurt to find that no perfumes had been placed in the room. Yet so has God dealt with us, — lovely flowers are the smiles of his goodness.'"

F. P.

ART. V. — *Moral Rule of Political Action; a Discourse delivered in Hollis Street Church, Sunday, January 27,* 1839. By JOHN PIERPONT. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1839. 12mo. pp. 24.

THE doctrine and aim of this discourse we heartily like. It is an application of religion to politics, or, a bringing of politics and all the forms of political action to the test of high moral and Christian principle. This surely is right, and we feel indebted to Mr. Pierpont for printing his sermon. The action of men in relation to government, and all questions which grow out of its various complex affairs, — it is a mere truism to say it, — comes just as much within the rules of religion and morals, and so under the cognizance of the teacher of religion and morals, as does their action in any other relation whatever. If there may be a right and a wrong in the political conduct of men, then, whether they fancy it or not, they are amenable to the moral law of God, as in all other cases of right and wrong; and the preacher consequently does not perform his duty till he proclaims the law, and ranges by its side the acts and the principles of those to whom he preaches, or of those who constitute the community in which he lives. Yet plain as this seems, it is virtually denied by many; and Mr. Pierpont suggests that such preaching as his may come under their censure, and be possibly branded as "political preaching." How he would be affected by such a charge, may be seen in the following paragraph:

"To do this," says Mr. Pierpont, that is, propose and illustrate a moral rule of political action, "*may*, possibly, be called political preaching. To which I can only reply, If it be so, let it be so. Moral principles are given us by our moral governor and judge, to be applied to every subject and in every relation in life. If we will assume social relations, and act as members of society; if we do not choose to satisfy ourselves with the hermit's life, but will constitute civil communities and political relations and act in them, then necessity is laid upon us — if we wish those relations to be enduring, and those communities prosperous, stable, and happy — to regulate, that is to rule, our action in them by some principle. And if the showing that this must be a *moral* principle be preaching politics, the more of such preaching there is, and the more it is regarded, in any community, the better — in all respects the better — for that community will it

be. And when I see so frequent and so gross departures, as in this country there are constantly witnessed, from moral principle in political action, I ask myself whether, in this respect, the pulpit in this country has been faithful to its trust." — p. 4.

We say with the preacher, that if showing that there must be a moral principle in politics, — that is, that dishonesty, prevarication, falsehood, and a host of associated vices, are as much vices when found in connexion with politics as in any other department of conduct and life, as justly offensive to God and as open to his condemnation, — be political preaching, then the more of it the better. But it is not political preaching, as that phrase is commonly used. On the contrary, it is eminently gospel or evangelical preaching. It is simply applying the rules of the religion of the New Testament to men's conduct and opinions in relation to the great affair of government, just as they are applied to men's conduct in relation to their professions and trades, to their domestic and social life. Is the conduct of men to be above the law of God the moment it is concerned about politics? Is the unjust man, the violent, the false, the fraudulent man to be no object of our disapprobation and rebuke, as soon as once intrenched within the sacred enclosure of politics? Not so. Religion knows no distinctions like these. Want of fidelity to conscience and to a professed faith, in political action, is surely the same offence in the eye of religion as want of fidelity to these divine guides in any other affairs in which we engage. A newspaper falsehood for political ends is — a falsehood. A political lie is — a lie, reeking with all the meanness, infamy, and guilt of one. And the editor, the writer, the voter, the party man, who resorts to subterfuges, to false statements, or deceptive ones, to unfair or dishonest measures, who takes or gives a bribe, to carry a question at an election or in a legislative hall, is the same offender with him who should be guilty of the like baseness on the exchange, in the counting-room, or the shop. To expose such conduct, to demonstrate its immorality, to hold it up to the indignation and abhorence of all honest men, is of the very highest order of Christian preaching. He who preaches so is emphatically a Christian preacher, and a Christian patriot. And the congregation or the community that would, with a sneer, denounce such preaching as political preaching, would with the same reason denounce that which should be specially addressed to men of business as mercantile preaching,

and therefore not Christian preaching. We hope and trust that the pulpit, any more than the press, will never be silent, while political life is as corrupt as the conduct of party men and the language of newspapers show it to be at the present day. But setting aside the duty of fidelity to his religion as a sufficient reason why the preacher should "preach politics," his patriotism, his love of country, of her institutions of government, should urge him to the same course. Can institutions like ours be preserved while they who vote and they who are voted for, — that is, they who administer the government, — agree so far as political action is concerned, to set at defiance the common rules of morals and religion, — rules whose authority they are ready to acknowledge in all the other relations and transactions of life?

There are no more crying sins in our land, at this day, than political sins; and we do not forget intemperance or slavery; or, if an exception must be made, it can only be in favor of *cheating* in the smaller transactions of trade. Falsehood in political action, and falsehood in trade are vices so common, and so destructive of all that is noble and elevated in character, pure and permanent in legislation, that that minister should be honored above others as the true minister and the genuine patriot, who now and then of a Sunday is willing to forget and forego some of the abstractions of a new philosophy or an old theology, that he may assail them and lay bare their abominations. Yet these two vices, which do more than intemperance to injure and degrade the general character of our people, soil its honor, and dim its beauty, are rarely named in the pulpit.

These are subjects, we are aware, not easy to treat with effect. They are among the most difficult, and call for great power in the preacher. While he deals with safe truisms, while he treats of sin in the general, or handles the great doctrines of faith, he will be listened to, and tolerated, though he should manifest but little of the ability and skill of a master workman. But when, leaving this more common ground, he attacks the usages (vices) in which particular classes of men are interested, he must show his knowledge of his subject to be most thorough and exact, his arguments clear and logical, and his grasp that of a giant, if he would escape the ridicule or abuse of those who stand ready to assail, with either weapon, the man who wanders too far from the beaten track.

Mr. Pierpont has done well, we think, to preach and then

print this vigorous and closely reasoned discourse. We take this Sermon and the noble discourse of Mr. Dewey in his last volume upon political morality, as signs that our clergy are beginning to think it their duty to carry religion into politics, as well as into other departments of life.

We subjoin two extracts to show the spirit and high moral standard of the discourse:

"The same principle and the same reasoning are applicable to the two — nay, the three, more recent parties; the Peace, the Temperance, and the Abolition parties, — which respectively claim morality as their basis, and purport to have, as their object, respectively, the abolition of war, intoxication, and domestic slavery. If, upon careful examination, I find either or all of these claims sustained, — that is, find that the parties are what they purport to be; and if I, with my lights or opportunities for forming a judgment upon the subject, am verily convinced that war, drunkenness, and involuntary servitude are moral evils, and therefore adverse to the highest interests of the individual and of the state; and if I believe, moreover, that moral action, by means of political machinery, will tend to remove or diminish these evils, I must, and if I am more a moral than a political man, I *shall* cast my vote for those who, in my opinion, will most efficiently legislate for the moral well-being of the state; and if those who are of the same *political* party with myself will not do this, I must abandon them in favor of such as will. If, for this, I am called to account by my fellow-partisans, my answer is short; it is — When my party run away from morality, they run away from me. Nor is there hazard, in this, to the commercial, manufacturing, or other pecuniary or temporal interests of the state. Your money cannot guard your morals, but morals will your money. They, who will protect the former, will not prove recreant to the latter. Protect the morals of a community, and *they* will protect its industry and all its results. "Seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things will be added unto you." — pp. 18, 19, 20.

Again:

"One word more: In all the cases here supposed, it is not merely my right — it is my *duty*, as a true and faithful servant of God, to obey him in using my political influence, my elective franchise, in his service, by placing those in political office, who, I believe, will be faithful to his cause; — in other words, I am bound to act in behalf of morality through political instrumen-

talities. With every talent intrusted, there comes to me the command, "Occupy, till I come." He is most truly the moral man who most faithfully employs all his talents — that is, all his means and faculties — for the advancement and establishment of the moral kingdom of God in his own heart and in the world. He, then, who acts, in this behalf, only by means of his own animal organization, but refuses to act by means of the political organizations of which he is himself a member, exercises but a part of his powers in the service of morality. Some of the moral evils, under which states suffer, and groan, and languish till they fall, are the creatures of political agency; and, as only the power that creates can destroy, they *can* be removed from the state, and the state itself thus redeemed from dissolution, by moral action through political organization. To refuse moral action in such cases, by such means, is to wrap a talent up in a napkin and *bury* it for safe keeping; to prove false to our allegiance to morality and to God. To act in such cases, for such an end, though all mankind forbid it, is to be faithful in the few things given to our trust; is to obey God rather than men."— pp. 21, 22.

Art. VI. — On the Nature, and Proper Evidences of a Revelation.

What is a revelation? and how is it to be authenticated? In other words, what do we mean when we say of any mission, any book, any religion, that it is a special divine communication? And what is the proper evidence of that fact?

These are questions of the highest importance in the philosophy of our religion. They embrace its whole peculiarity, — all that distinguishes it from a system of purely natural religion. I say, distinctly, the philosophy of our religion; because I do not mean to confound the philosophy with the feeling of it. And I do not intend to deny this feeling to any one, on the ground that he differs with me in regard to the philosophy.

This distinction, I think, is wide and palpable; and it is essential, too, to the maintenance of individual rights and Christian concord. On any other ground, we must have as

many Christianities as there are sects. For the philosophy of the doctrines of Christianity has as much to do with our virtue, as the philosophy of its origin.

This distinction exists, too, in the nature of things. A man's virtue is founded on the natural influence of truth, and not upon the consideration that it is supernaturally communicated. Let the humblest reader open the New Testament, penetrate into its meaning, and breathe its spirit, and he is a good man. It is noways important to this result, that he should ever have defined a miracle, or ever have heard of the question about naturalism and supernaturalism.

It is the more important to make this distinction, because questions of this nature are coming in among us, and indeed seem naturally to belong to the progress of Christian investigation. German inquiry has fully developed them, and English and American inquiry is approaching them. Christianity fought its first battle on the ground of the evidences; and miracles, we say, helped the argument. It fought its second battle on the arena of doctrines; and logic brought its theses and syllogisms. It is now subjected to a severer question. And *this* is the question. What precisely *is* a revelation? This question is approached with various views. Christianity, some think, is in danger of perishing amidst cold technicalities and dry moralities, that lack all the freshness of inward and instant inspiration; or it is in danger of sinking, like a worn-out giant, under the armor of its historical form;—and sentiment, spontaneity, intuition, transcendentalism, I know not what,—has come to the rescue. In Germany, the assailant of the old, established foundations of Christianity is Rationalism, or Naturalism. It will admit nothing supernatural; it explains away all the miracles; it respects Jesus as simply the wisest and purest of teachers.

Now, if I be asked, what place I assign to these discussions, I still answer that they belong, purely and entirely, in my judgment, to the philosophy of Christianity. I cannot consider them as involving any man's virtue or piety. Let a man receive the spiritual teachings of Jesus Christ, imbibe his temper, and imitate his example, and no pale of a creed shall bar me from the acknowledgment of him as a good man. Show me the image of Christ in a man, and it is enough. And that image may be, and is, reflected through a thousand different atmospheres and shadings of opinion. I am weary of the pal-

try sectarian discussion that is ever going on upon this point. I cannot help recording my impatient and indignant protest against any criterion of a man's goodness and acceptance with God, but his actual conduct and his inward and living affections. Has he got them from the right source, do you ask? I answer, has he not got them? Gold is gold, whether it comes coined from the mint, or is brought from the virgin ore of the hidden mine.

How much must a man believe, in order to be a Christian, do you ask? He must believe everything, I am tempted to say, and he must believe nothing. He must believe everything concerning the beauty, the grandeur, and the joy of the life and spirit of Christ; and he need believe nothing concerning his metaphysical nature, or the time of his creation, or the manner in which the divine inspiration entered into his soul, or the philosophical explanation of his miracles. To err upon points like these is human, and therefore pardonable. To err about essential goodness, — about that goodness which was embodied in the life of Jesus, — is not human, but devilish and damnable. That is to say, it is intrinsic, essential, and abiding misery! — for why should we blind ourselves about a matter so unspeakably plain and momentous?

There lies, then, the bright, illuminated page of the Gospel; there it *is*, come whence it may. There are written, the sayings of him who spake as never man spake. And many a truth there written, were but ill bartered for a world in exchange. In the joy and comfort of this possession, I can willingly throw the question about the mode of its creation and transmission into the darkness of antiquity. I can, without fear, take one side or other of the question; or dismiss it altogether, as a question not to be solved. I can refer it to that unsearchable counsel through which all things exist. The world exists; Christian truth exists; and they came from God. Let me only so receive the truth, and use the world, as to attain to essential, immortal virtue and happiness; and the questions how the world was created, or how Christian truth was originated, I can leave to schoolmen and philosophers. Wheat grows; bread nourishes me, whether I understand the philosophy of the matter or not.

But still it may be asked, will he, who believes in the Bible as a mere book of truths, a book of spiritual intuitions, and not a supernatural revelation, ever attain to the required virtue and

happiness? Is not supernaturalism, as a faith, necessary to produce that effect? I answer as before, that I can see no necessary connexion between these things; and that I see none such pointed out in the book. The simple truth is represented as the great regenerating agent. "The truth shall make you free," not the origination of that truth. We are taught that he who stands in the *field of nature*, — he who is a law to himself, and acts up to its light, — is "accepted." Much more may he who thus stands in the field of Scripture, and acts up to its light, be accepted. But are we not saved by faith, it may be said. Yes; but we must learn, if we have not yet learnt, that Bible faith is the heart's faith. It is not a belief in miracles; it is not a belief in supernaturalism; it is a belief in truth. And I know, as far as I can know anything from observation, that the deepest and most devoted faith in Jesus, may co-exist with a mode of speculation, that divests his character of everything but its self-evident and soul-entrancing beauty. I may think that it errs; but I should no more think of charging it with vital unbelief and irreligion, than I should the faith of John or Polycarp.

I have thus attempted, in very few words, to assign to the inquiry before us, its proper place in Christianity. Do I then say, that it is of no importance? Certainly not. It is of vast importance, as I conceive, to the body of believers. It is possible for us, no doubt, to penetrate into the heart of Christianity, unaided by any thoughts of its supernatural origin. But such thoughts are fitted justly and powerfully to influence our minds; and therefore, if they be true, they assume at once a high practical importance. Besides; what God hath done to teach his earthly children, it concerns our gratitude and piety to know. Moreover, my own view of the question makes it of greater interest than I have represented it, in justice to those who differ from me. For I conceive that the claim of Jesus and his Apostles, *to be the teachers that they were, was* avouched by miracles; that all the peculiarity, in kind, that distinguished them from other teachers, is based upon miracles, either of fact or of experience; that their special mission has no other logical support. In fine, and at any rate, the truth, whatever it be, has its own value as truth, and every honest mind will seek to know it. And although I cannot contend for the truth, or what I conceive to be the truth, on this point, as I would contend for the spiritual foundations of religion, yet certainly it is not in-

different to me, whether I judge rightly of the conditions under which Christianity is presented to me; and this is the question before us.

What, then, are we to understand by a revelation from heaven? Or, in what light do we regard that succession of teachers, and that series of communications, of which we have an account in the Bible?

Now, there are two views of this question, clearly distinguishable, broadly contrasted, and covering the whole ground, that either is, or can be, in controversy. Either the Bible is a revelation, or it is not. Either the teachers were inspired, or they were not inspired. To speak more definitely; either the teachers were sent from God on a special mission to instruct the world, or they were such men, such reformers as are, in every age, springing up from the occasions and exigencies of society. Either the light that was in them, came from an extraordinary influence of heaven, or it came from the natural and unaided operations of their own minds. There is no middle ground. On the one hand, we see a succession of special messengers from God, supernaturally endowed, and clothed with more than human authority; and on the other, we see men, whose claims are, in their kind, to be completely confounded with those of Socrates and Confucius.

Let not this inquiry be mixed up with matters that do not belong to it. The question is not about the degree of the inspiration, the divinity of the style, or the universal infallibility of the teaching. The whole inquiry, — the only inquiry of any interest to me, I confess, — turns upon a single point. Is there, or is there not, to be recognised in these writings, in these dispensations, the element of supernatural aid? Did they come from God, only as all things come from God, only as the inspiration of genius or the energy of heroism comes from him? or, did they come in some special manner, — with traits and signatures not to be found in any of those manifestations? Are these writings but the choice and venerated compositions of their respective ages? or are they special divine communications? In other words, suppose that when God had made the world, and established the laws of the human mind, he had left all things to work out their natural results, — had left all to the natural course of his general providence; should we *then* have had such writings as the Psalms and the Gospels? — should we

then have ever heard of such teachers, in their respective ages, as David and the prophets, as Jesus and the Apostles?

But let me attempt still further to define the idea which I entertain of a revelation. I maintain, certainly, that the element of the supernatural is in it. But I do not say that any supernatural inspiration was requisite to the true narration of facts, histories, miracles. I do not say that every spiritual truth written in the Bible was then first revealed. I do not say that it ever was revealed. Moral first truths are a portion of the original stock of every man's ideas. It is most gratuitous injustice to charge the supernaturalist with saying or implying that *these* truths are to be reached only through a miraculous revelation. And, on the other hand, it is a mere carelessness in language, on this subject, to talk about a revelation of truth in consciousness. We might as well talk about a revelation of truth in sensation. The ideas of a God and of moral rectitude are pre-supposed in a revelation. When the sacred teacher recognises the truth that there is a God, when he says that God is love, when he says that men ought to love and obey him, he does not teach them that which they do not know, but he takes for granted that which they do know. If this is all that is meant by those who so strenuously insist, that human consciousness interprets and verifies Scripture truth, that there is a light within us which opens a way to that truth, and that it needs no miracle to reveal it, the wonder is, not that they know it, but that they say it. One is tempted to ask where they have lived all this time, amidst what books they have passed their lives, when, upon this recognised doctrine of all ages and of all theologies, they insist as if it were some new discovery of their own, and gave them some new claim to the appellation of Christian believers.*

---

* A writer in the Boston Quarterly Review affects to be sorry that Professor Norton, in his late most admirable work on the Genuineness of the Gospels, has proved himself to be an infidel! As a chain of reasoning, that work would be most admirable, though it proved the most indifferent thing on earth; but it does establish a point of great importance, and one most pertinent to the matter of Christian belief. I am not at all concerned to point out the disingenuity of that article; I suppose it is sufficiently obvious; but it certainly does surprise me, that a writer, who undertakes to discuss a point in Biblical criticism, should think himself entitled to speak with contempt, of a work in that department, of such extraordinary logical acumen and accurate learning.

This is not at all the question. Nobody ever pretended that it is the office of Scripture to reveal the primary truths of Natural Religion, or the original intuitions of human consciousness. As such it is not a revelation at all. As such it stands on the same ground as the works of Plato or Plotinus. The question is, Is there anything more in the Bible, — anything higher, — anything peculiar — anything in it, or connected with it, that commends it to us as a special divine communication? I maintain that there is. First, there is something *in* it, that does not belong to the province of bare intuition, or of unaided reason; and that is, *the relation of certain truths to certain facts.* We knew that God is good, — that is a truth, — but we did not know the fact, that he would take that special interest in the spiritual welfare, in the salvation of the human race, that is taught in the Scriptures. And we did not know the fact, that his goodness would provide for us that future life that is brought to light in his word. These are momentous revelations; and to me I confess that they seem most needful. I might have hoped concerning these things, but without a communication from above, I could scarcely have believed. I should have seen reasons for them, but I should also have seen reasons against them. I could scarcely have expected to carry my confidence on these points, farther than Socrates and Plato did; and their state of mind would, to me, have been extremely unsatisfactory and painful, as it was to them. I should have wanted, as they did, some one to teach me. So needful, indeed, is the communication, that after all teachings, it seems to me that the faith of the Christian world is still most seriously defective on these two points, — the paternal and personal relation of God to us, and our consequent filial and individual relation to him, — and the overwhelming doctrine of a future life. The mission, the death, and the resurrection of Christ are the grand revelations and pledges of these truths, and the world needs far more deeply to study them than it has done.

In the next place, there is something connected with the Bible communication, which awakens a profound interest, and that is a special divine commission, attested by miracles. I shall consider, under another head, how pertinently miracles are related to this point; but, for the present, I wish to state what, as I conceive, belongs to the nature of the communication. I hold that it was clothed with a special sanction. The sacred teachers did not speak what they thought, with no other reason

for its being received, but that they thought so. They were sent, commissioned, authorized to speak. Their warrant was not merely that which the inspiration of genius or piety gives; it was something higher. And even if they had uttered nothing but intuitive truths, it would give an inexpressible interest to those truths to know that God had specially commissioned holy men to utter them, — to re-affirm those verities which he had already uttered as oracles in the sanctuary of the human heart. Those verities, too, might have partly faded from the human mind, and needed to be impressed again by the stamp of miracle; I do not say to be revealed, but to be impressed. Besides; what *are* intuitive truths to other and barbarous ages, may not, to us, be quite so clear. It was far enough from being an intuitive truth to the Jews, that God was equally the Father and Friend of all mankind. It was far enough from being an intuitive truth to the Roman masters of the world, that the subjects and slaves trodden beneath their feet, had equal rights and interests with themselves, before the eye of heaven. And it is far enough from being an intuitive truth to the whole world, — scarcely yet is it a *truth* to the searching and passionate cry after good, — that the suffering and forgiving patience of death, the glorified humiliation of the cross, the triumph of love and meekness, should be the power, to raise the world to purity and happiness.

But be this as it may, — the bare circumstance that the Almighty Being has been pleased to give extraordinary attestation to any truth, must, by itself, be ever a subject of profound interest. It is not an interposition without an object. Amidst rude ages, ever lapsing, on one hand or another, into idolatry and error, — before the world, by the aids of freedom and the printing-press, had entered upon the great modern progress of knowledge and happiness, — such interposition was most pertinent. And the facts that proclaim it, if they be received in this light, must forever be among the most precious treasures of human knowledge. The mighty shadow of the past is ever spread over us, and comes down upon us as a presence. I feel that the mind of the whole Christian world is, at this moment, impressed, and needfully impressed, by the bare conviction that God has spoken to it. The thunderings of Sinai have not yet died away in the ears of men, and the sighs of the cross, God's altar of sacrifice, are echoed from the stricken, confiding, and comforted hearts of millions. How different is our conviction

of the divine protection, care, and teaching, from that which would be produced by the inflexible administration of general laws. It is almost as great as the difference between a cherished childhood and a hapless orphanage. "I will not leave you orphans," says our Savior; "I will come to you." And accordant with this representation is our feeling about the divine goodness. It is not as if the Almighty had sent forth this globe, on its sublime and distant journey through the heavens, alone; as if he had placed everything beyond the reach of his interposing hand; as if he had left matter and mind to work out their inevitable and uncontrolled results. This is not the feeling which the Bible inspires; but it is, that God hath visited the world with the day-spring from on high, — hath holpen his people, — hath interposed for our salvation, — hath guided and comforted us, — hath *spoken*, even as an earthly parent does in emergencies of peril and distress, some special, some warning or soothing word.

I have thus attempted to state what I understand by the nature of revelation.

Let us now turn, a moment, to the argument.

I defend the view of revelation now stated and commonly received among us, on two grounds; first, that the Bible assumes to be such a revelation, and secondly, that it puts its claim to be such, upon the basis of miracles. I shall confine the argument here, to a single point; partly because I have no space for any discussion beyond that; but also because it is the highest and most material example of all, and involves in fact, the whole ground contended for. The claim of Jesus, then, to be received as a teacher, — what was it? — and how was it attested?

Upon the first of these questions, what is the language of our Savior? "I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me." "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." It would be impossible, however, within my limits, to do any justice to this argument by quotations. Language of this character fills the Gospels. No writings of any sage or philosopher, ever bore such an assumption of authority. The idea which Jesus conveys to us of himself is, that in this respect he stood alone. Good men there were around him, and they had good thoughts,

which in some sense they derived from God; but for himself he asserts a peculiar derivation. Not even the Apostles partook with him of this distinction. He derived his authority from God; they from him. John the Baptist was the forerunner; he was the Messiah. "I have greater witness," he says, "than that of John; for the works which the Father hath empowered me to perform, the very works, that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me."

Certainly, if Jesus had a peculiar and divine commission, and meant to assert that claim, it is not easy to conceive of any language more unequivocally expressive of that fact and of that claim, than the language which he was constantly using. And if he had not an authority from heaven essentially different from that which every wise and good man possesses; if he was clothed with no sanction but that of self-taught truth; if there was nothing to mark or distinguish him, but the simple intuitions that swelled his bosom in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth; it is utterly inconceivable that he should have spoken of himself as he did. If it were so, I confess that I should think of the modesty of Socrates, and be troubled for our great Example.*

In the next place, this special commission, I hold, was avouched by miracles. I do not say that Jesus appealed to no other criterion. I do not forget that he said, that he, who "will do the will of God, shall know of the doctrine." But I say that he appealed to *this*, — to miracles, — and that he appealed to this oftener than to any other. I do not see how this position can be denied. Nothing, in language, can be more distinct than this reference. The first miracle, which he ever wrought, set forth this attestation and produced the natural results. "This first miracle Jesus wrought in Cana of Gallilee, and manifested his glory; and his disciples believed on him."

---

* Nor can I explain this absence of modesty in the character of Jesus, — his apparent unconsciousness of any fault, his assumption of unimpeachable excellence, into consistency with any theory but that of his sinless perfection. He is, indeed, our example, but certainly with some limitations. He is *not* an example of penitence and humility; I mean that part of humility which implies conscious frailty and imperfection. How deeply does that feeling sink into every good, Christian mind! Did it ever sink into his? Could he have ever felt the bitterness of self-reproach? Could he have ever wept for sin? "He was, in all points, tempted as we are; *yet without sin.*" Is not this itself a miraculous distinction?

John once sent to Jesus, and said, "art thou he that should come, or look we for another? Jesus answered and said, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see; the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up," — and beneficent also is this mission, for — "the poor have good tidings preached to them." The Jews come round about him, with the question whether he is the sent of God; they say, "how long dost thou make us to doubt? if thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." And Jesus answers them, "I told you before, and ye believed not; the works which I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." Most natural, therefore, — most pertinent to the whole record of the life of Jesus, — is that conclusion, which Peter expresses in his speech recorded in the second chapter of Acts: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and signs and wonders which God did by him, in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know, — him ye have slain; whom God hath raised up." His miraculous resurrection, indeed, is made the conclusive proof and seal of his whole commission.

Now, I say that miracle proves this very point, — is pertinent to this end and to nothing else. Take it as you will, — *somewhere* in a communication attested by miracles, is the element of supernaturalism. It is impossible to regard the religion which is accompanied by such tokens, as standing in any but an extraordinary relation to the instruction of mankind.

But what is a miracle? — and how does it prove a revelation? These questions belong to the second branch of our inquiry, viz. What is the proper evidence of a revelation?

To the first question, What is a miracle? I answer, it is what it professes to be. No believer in the New Testament can object to this definition.

It is true, a man may deny the facts altogether; he may please to say — anything can be *said* — that they are mere legendary tales, mere figments of the imagination; he may say that Jesus never worked miracles, nor ever pretended to do so; that all this has come from the enthusiasm, ignorance, superstition, or craft of his biographers. A man may say this, but I cannot see on what ground such a man is to call himself a *believer*. Nor, in fact, has this reckless supposition any such consistency or coherence, as to deserve the name, or respect, of a

theory. The Christian testimony must be regarded as folly or forgery on this supposition. Nay, not folly, but forgery must it be. No folly, no supposed credulity, can account for such inventions. The miracles are palpable facts, interwoven in the whole texture of the history, and constantly appealed to by the Master himself. The writers — eye-witnesses as they evidently were — must have known whether these things were done or not. And to reject these facts is to maintain, that the writers, sober men, — men whose freedom from exaggeration is, in the circumstances, really wonderful, — men of singular purity and elevation, — men under the solemn responsibility of teaching a religion from heaven, — and men, too, in the face of persecution, torture, and death, — should have deliberately devised a parcel of absurd stories, to give importance to their communication. No; the severe and impartial histories of the New Testament can bear no such supposition. And he, who indulges in such dreamy imaginations about this matter, and says, "It was a long time ago, and the age was dark, and the world was superstitious," seems to me to want not the pious faith to believe, but the poetic faith to conceive, what the time was, and what the spirit of the time and of the men, with which he is dealing. Nay, and his loose and vague notions of things entirely vitiate the record and ruin the testimony, on which his religion is based. And his position seems to me as absurd, as if he should pretend firmly to take his stand on a foundation, whose corner stone he had knocked away from beneath him. If this is believing, I should like to know what infidelity is.

I think I am entitled to say, therefore, that the believer in the New Testament must take the miraculous facts as they stand, and explain them in some way. Upon what principle shall he explain them? What *is* a miracle? I answer again, it is what it professes to be. What *does* it profess to be? It seems to me that the very nature of the case answers for it. Take the palpable facts, a dead man suddenly raised to life, — a sick man instantly restored to health, — and these facts in connexion with the claims of one who professes to have come as a teacher from God; and what can they be designed for, but to prove his commission? Now, this is precisely what our Savior avers. To bring the case home to ourselves, — let us suppose that a man stood before us, and said, I come to you with a special message from God, and to prove to you that I am thus com-

missioned, I will cause this dead body to rise before you. Now, construed by the intent, what is, and must be, the character of this event?

I will answer, in the first place, negatively. It cannot be a trick; it cannot be sleight of hand; for then it would be no proof. It cannot be, any way, a mere illusion to my senses; for then it would be no proof. It cannot be a miracle merely to my ignorance; for *then* it would be no proof. Strange proof it were of a communication from the God of truth, that I am thoroughly deceived and duped by it. This strange theory of miracles is thus put forward by the author of Sartor Resartus. "To that Dutch King of Siam, an icicle had been a miracle; whoso had carried with him an air-pump and phial of vitriolic ether, might have worked a miracle. To my horse, again, who unhappily is still more unscientific, do I not work a miracle, and magical '*open sesame*,' every time I please to pay twopence, and open for him an impassable *schlagbaum* or shut turnpike?" This may be "natural Supernaturalism," or sensible nonsense; but what philosophy it is, I must leave others to find out. But this I certainly can find out, and see very plainly, that he who should profess to come to me with a message from God, and should profess to work a miracle to convince me of it, and then should only practise upon my ignorance, — should palm off upon me for a miracle, that which the air-pump can do, or his superior knowledge had ascertained, would be guilty of the grossest imposture! And while, on the one hand, I should undoubtedly reject the Bible miracles, or any miracles that were accompanied with the teaching of impiety and vice, I should, on the other, as certainly reject the claim of any teaching to come from heaven, which was vitiated by such fraudulent pretensions to the miracle-working power.

But what, then, is a miracle? I answer, that I cannot understand it to be anything else than a deviation from the order of nature. Now there is, in some of the philosophy of the day, an almost invincible repugnance to admit of any such deviation. It cannot bear the idea; and so it resorts to the violent supposition of a seeming miracle. What, I pray to be informed, is a *seeming* miracle? It appears to me as if it were very like a lying truth, or an unreal fact. It sounds, in my ear, very like a contradiction in terms. And when I look more deeply into the meaning of the thing, I am only still more impressed with the same conviction. What *is* the real, and what

is the apparent, in such a case? *Are* they at war witho ne another? Lazarus has sickened and died. He has lain in the grave four days already. Jesus is about to visit the house of affliction, and he says to his disciples, "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent that ye may believe." We see the purpose of his errand. He comes to the disconsolate sisters, and says, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die; believest thou this?" — a truth so unspeakably momentous as to be worthy of a miracle to show it. He accompanies the weeping throng to the grave; and he lifts up his eyes and says, "Father I thank thee that thou hast heard me; and I know that thou hearest me always; but because of the people that stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me. Then he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth! And the dead came forth."

Now, what is this? A seeming miracle? — an event in perfect coincidence with the laws of life, — nature having some secret power to raise a dead man to life, once perhaps, in a thousand years, as a certain plant has to produce a flower once in a hundred, — and about which all that was strange is, that Jesus had some superior, some scientific knowledge of it? For if his knowledge was not scientific, it was miraculous, — and we are obliged to admit divination still. But *was* it merely a superior knowledge acquired in the ordinary way? Was Jesus a wonderful philosopher, who had studied in some unknown schools, in some academic groves, never heard of, in Greece? or in some catacombs, never visited, in Egypt? Then, indeed, there were no miracle; and then there were no proof. Then, indeed, there were nothing in the case but stupendous imposture. But where am I wandering from a very plain case? Here is an event, without precedent, and without parallel; an event which is a palpable deviation from the order of nature; an event, which, if it be not such in some way, proves nothing, — proves nothing to the purpose for which it is solemnly, and in the presence of God, alleged; an event, which, viewed in any other way, is used for the grossest deception; and yet this event, in defiance of all these considerations, is pronounced a *seeming* miracle.

And why seeming? Because, says the objector, in the first place, "we do not know everything of nature, and therefore we cannot know but this event may belong to its order." The

force of this argument, which Mr. Carlyle and others are urging with so much confidence, depends entirely, as I conceive, upon a misstatement of the question. The question is not about *knowing* at all; but about believing. The mistake arises from an attempt to transfer certainty to the department of belief. The reasoning involves a palpable *non sequitur*. The premises have nothing to do with the conclusion. The argument fairly and broadly stated is this: I do not know everything; therefore I cannot believe anything. I do not know but Bonaparte was an incarnate devil; therefore I do not believe that he was a man. I do not know but the world has existed from eternity; therefore I do not believe that it was made. Is this the language of philosophy, and common sense? Is a man allowed, in questions like these, to retreat to the uttermost corner and cranny of pyhrronism, and to hold that that is the very perch of philosophy?

And yet even there, I think, can we reach him. For there is something that we do know in this case. We do know that the miracles, on his theory, prove nothing; that they prove nothing to the purpose for which they are expressly alleged. If we take the miracles for what they plainly profess to be, we *must* take them for deviations from the order of nature.

But this, says the objector, in the second place, is what I *cannot*—I never *can* admit. "Why, herein is a marvellous thing, that ye cannot admit this! Since the world began it was not heard that any man opened the eyes of one born blind, or raised to life a man that was dead in his grave. If this man were not of God, he could do nothing."

In truth, I think that the *argumentum ad ignorantiam* does avail us here, as it does not avail the objector in the former case. In that case a man says, "I do not know everything, and therefore I do not *believe* in miracles." Now we take the objector on his own ground, and we say, you do not know everything; how then can you deny that a miracle may be a thing,—a fact that has really taken place? You do not know that the Almighty cannot suspend the laws of nature; you do not know that he will not; how then is it impossible for you to admit such a deviation?

Indeed, I cannot help thinking that much of the difficulty about miracles arises from throwing the case into the darkness of antiquity; from vague and loose talk about the early Christian time as an age of wonders and prodigies; from failing, in

fact, to bring the mind into real and close contact with the evidence. If a company of us stood by a barren and blasted heath, and one should draw near us and say, "I have come to you with a special message from the Almighty, and in witness of it, this barren tract shall be instantly covered with grain, fit for harvest;" and if "it was so;" and if, to satisfy ourselves that there was no illusion, we had not only "heard," but had seen with our eyes, and looked upon, and our "hands had handled" the evidence; and if we then should turn round upon the messenger, and should say, "we do not know all the powers of nature, and therefore we do not believe that this is a real miracle; some extraordinary energies of nature, to us unknown, to you well known, may have produced this result, and therefore we cannot admit your claim;" what, I pray, would be thought of such an answer? Would it be any less than impertinent and unphilosophical? Nay, would it not be something more?

We are now prepared to ask, how miracles are proof of a revelation; and to state what is to be understood by the applicability of such proof.

On this subject there is a great deal of loose language scattered up and down among the books of theology and philosophy, and through the current talk of the present day, from which to disentangle the truth, only requires that we should just simply distinguish between things that differ.

The main distinction to be made, is that between truth and revealed truth; and between truth, and the *commission* to utter it. There are, in the Bible, self-evident truths; truths embraced by all human consciousness. To these, miracles have no application; they are presupposed in the case. They are not the revelation, but the basis on which the revelation proceeds. Revelation has nothing to do with them; unless it might be, in some dark age, to revive and re-affirm them. Properly speaking, revelation has no more to do with convincing us that there is a difference between right and wrong, than that there is a difference between white and black. But there may be relations of these primary convictions which are quite beyond the reach of human consciousness. And there may be a special commission from heaven to speak to man, with which human *consciousness* has no more to do, than with what is passing in the planet Herschel. And to these assumptions of superior, of superhuman knowledge and authority, miracles have

so direct and palpable an application, that nothing else conceivable as an argument *has any* application to them. Nay, the things themselves are miracles.

Now, we hear a great deal about the difference between the internal and the external evidence; and we find a disposition in many, altogether to prefer the former; altogether to underrate the latter. What *is* the internal evidence? If it be only the self-evident truth, or obvious moral beauty of the Bible; *that* no more proves it to be a divine communication, than the same truth or beauty proves the writings of Fenelon, or even of Rousseau, to be a divine communication. Any book in the world is divine on this hypothesis. But if, by the internal evidence be meant that manifest moral superiority to the age, for which unaided human powers cannot account, — that, for instance, which appears in the Psalms of David, and in the sayings of Jesus, — this, I grant, *is* evidence. But this is a miracle. And it is a miracle too, which, by no means possesses that charm of extreme obviousness, which is commonly so much lauded in the so-called internal evidence. It is a miracle, fully to apprehend which, requires a thorough knowledge of the history, literature, and philosophy of ancient times, such as few possess; and an acute perception of the essential difficulty of moral illumination, which is perhaps still more rare. If simplicity, in the evidence, be what is demanded, the miracles of the New Testament possess that quality in a far higher degree.

We hear men and women talking very loftily about their own convictions, their own intuitions. These are enough for *them*. They want no miracles; though it has pleased Infinite Wisdom to provide such. The miracles, with them, instead of being the stable, and strong, and enduring facts of our Christian dispensation, seem to have become the weak and beggarly elements of some older, some worn-out dispensation. They have come upon quite new ground. They have acquired a transcendent illumination.

Well, what is it? What is this illumination? What is this wonderful intuition? I suppose they will not hold, with Luther, and Calvin, and Edwards, that this spiritual perception is itself a miracle. If not, then this perception is common to all human beings. The Hindoo upon the banks of the Ganges, — the red man of our own forest wilds, hath it. Hath he, then, a revelation? Not in degree, indeed, but in *kind*, — hath he as truly a special communication from God, as we have? Or, if

this is not maintained, will it yet be said, that when a special communication is presented, he hath that spiritual perception which will of itself attest it to be such? But what is the nature of this evidence? In a certain book, a man intuitively perceives certain moral truths. Does it from hence follow that the book is divine, or that it contains any special communication from heaven? Hath it any more sanction than any other good book? And is it, then, the result of this self-complacent intuition, that it strips the Bible of every trait but of mere human wisdom, — of a merely human communication, — of all but mere human authority? And are we altogether mistaken in supposing, that God has been pleased to give us some other manifestations of his paternal interest for us, than those which are found in our natural and intuitive convictions?

Well, it is said, what, after all, have you got? What avails this external evidence of miracles, when most learned theologians admit, that the Apostles, like other men, were liable to mistake? It is evident that there are some discrepancies in the narrative; and that some of the Apostles erred in supposing that the end of the world was at hand. I answer, that this objection is altogether hypercritical and irrelevant. It is of no sort of importance that we should maintain, in order to establish the value of the message, that the messengers possessed any superhuman infallibility. In fact, what absolute infallibility can mean, in a case where human language is the vehicle of thought, and human minds are its recipients, I profess myself unable to conceive.

But this unerring accuracy, whether of style or of thought, has nothing to do with the substantial claims of the communication. The messengers were human teachers and witnesses. Suppose that they were commissioned to give a divine warrant to the hope of a future life; and to dissipate all Pantheistic dreams, by assuring us that the Infinite God hath a special and spiritual care for his creatures on earth; and in fine, to hold up the life and the death of Jesus as the great example and hope of mankind. Was any supernatural infallibility needed to teach these things?

There is one point indeed, and only one, where the teacher's fallibility would very nearly touch him; and that is, in regard not to his communications, but to his own impressions. In this respect, miracles seem as necessary to the teacher's assurance, as to ours. For how otherwise could he know that he had any

special commission to teach? He might have an impression to that effect; but how, with any just knowledge of the boundless vagaries of the human mind, could he be assured that it was not a mere impression, — a mistake, — a hallucination? I know of nothing that could lawfully satisfy himself, but a miracle. And for myself, as a receiver of his message, I should say that the more confidence he had, *without* that confirmation, the less should I confide in him. The world has been full of such vain confidences. The history of such fanaticism naturally puts us on the most jealous guard. I once had a fellow-student come to me, with a solemn and preternatural air, and say, "I come to you with a message from God!" "Well," I said to him, "work a miracle." It was the natural demand that sprung to my lips, as the only thing that could authenticate such a mission. And so, I think, every man would say.

Once more; it is said, nay, and gravely laid down in books of theology, that miracles do not prove the religion to be true, but rather that the religion proves the miracles to be true; that miracles do not establish the doctrine, but the doctrine the miracles. I confess that I must feel more respect than I do for the old theologians, and must see more clearness in their reasonings on this particular point, before I can give any weight either to their authority or arguments. Luther considers FAITH to be the true miracle, and says that those recorded in the New Testament are fit only to influence heathens and children. Calvin repudiates all argument. He says that the Scripture "is self-authenticated, carrying with it its own evidence, and ought not to be made the subject of demonstration and arguments from reason." "We seek not arguments or probabilities to support our judgment," he says, "but submit our judgments and understandings as to a thing concerning which it is impossible to judge." "It is such a persuasion as requires no reasons; and in fine, such a sentiment as cannot be produced but by a revelation from heaven."* Thus do these theologians, fitly beginning with the denial of reason, subvert the order of proofs laid down in the Scriptures, and presumptuously substitute for the Bible miracles the miracle of their own experience. The simplest distinction will extricate the subject from all the difficulties which these writers, and such as these, have thrown

---

*Institutes, Chap. vii.

around it. The miracles, say they, prove nothing without a previous conviction of the truth of the religion. Now, if they had used the phrase *mission of Christ*, instead of the phrase *religion of Christ*, they would have felt that they must pause on the threshold of such a rash and absurd declaration. For what is the point to be proved? *Not* the truth of the doctrine, nor of the religion, so far as it consists in love, mercy, and good works. All this was true, and known to be true, before the religion came. The point to be proved, if there is anything to be *proved*, is this, the divine mission of Jesus. It is the simple fact, that Jesus came with a special commission from the Father to teach and save the world. Now, can any man open his eyes, — upon Scripture, or upon reason, or upon the face of his fellow, — and say, the miracles do not prove the mission, but the mission proves the miracles? That is, — I must be convinced that a thing is true; and then I am prepared to believe in the miracle that is wrought to prove it. Suppose a man should come, like Swedenborg, and say, "In heaven there are palaces and groves, gardens and streams, and I am commissioned from heaven to tell you so;" and suppose he should, as in reason he ought, offer to submit his message and his mission to the test of miracle. What would be the answer of this extraordinary logic? "No, do not work a miracle. First, let me be convinced of the truth of what you say; and then I shall believe in the miracle!"

I cannot stop to answer all the careless questions that are put, upon this point, because I think that the distinction which I have stated, and reiterated till I fear it is wearisome, will carry us through the whole subject. They seem all to be implied, however, in this one confused sentence of Mr. Coleridge. "What can we think," he says, "of a theological theory which makes its whole religion to consist in the belief of miracles?" We may think what we will, I answer, and nobody will be harmed by it. Nobody ever pretended to take this ground. The whole religion of a man includes his essential virtue. No one says that this "consists" in *any* speculative conviction. Then, again, as to mere belief, — to what, strictly speaking, does it relate? Not to the self-evident truths of the Bible. These are certainties, not matters of belief. Belief takes hold of the mission, and of certain facts, not self-evident, which are attested by it. Belief is founded on evidence. But yet again; when we say that this evidence is miracle, we do not say that

it stands alone. It is implied in the very case supposed, that the miracle-worker be a good man, — his doctrine good, — his communication of good tendency, — his mission beneficent. A messenger professes to come from a good king, to an officer of his government, and says, You are commanded to put to death the three best men in the country. The officer says, I cannot believe that this order came from the king. The messenger produces the monarch's signet-ring. The officer says, I will sooner believe that you have stolen it, than I will believe in this message. Doubtless he is right. The essential conditions of evidence do not require him to believe. The preliminary ground is wanting. But suppose that the messenger proposes to him some apparently good, but very extraordinary enterprise, involving immense interests. Then the officer demands some voucher to prove that this is the will of the king. And what will this be? It must be something that none other than the monarch himself can give, — his signature or his signet. All this applies, with enhanced force, to a communication from heaven.

But may not the signature be forged, — the signet stolen? This brings us to the only remaining question, about the evidence of miracles. It is said that there may be false miracles as well as true: that miracles may be wrought by demoniacal agency; and that it is implied in Scripture, that there are bad miracles, or miracles at least that prove nothing. I answer, in the first place, that even if there were such miracles, it is none the less true that other miracles *are appealed* to, by Jesus himself, in attestation of his mission; and I might stop with this reply. But I answer, in the second place, that I do not believe that any such miracles ever were wrought. I do not believe that the Author of nature ever permitted its laws to be suspended in attestation of a falsehood. Whether or not, there is a class of beings called demons, I do not know. But supposing there were, — it would amount to scarcely less than a contradiction in terms, to say that the God of truth would permit them to assume his peculiar prerogative to prove a falsehood.

But I am sensible that this is not the point that is sought to be controverted. There is no belief in demons, I suppose, in the minds of those who now-a-days bring this argument from false miracles; nor do they believe that the false miracles are really interruptions of the order of nature; but it is designed by this argument to throw doubt altogether over this species of evidence, if not indeed over this species of fact.

For this purpose certain passages of Scripture are appealed to. In the first place it is said, in the Bible, that if a prophet or apostle assert palpable falsehood, he is not to be believed though he should work a miracle. Very true; but does it follow that any such miracle was ever wrought? Or, when in ages addicted to divining and necromancy, men are put upon their guard against deception, does it follow that there is no truth to be separated and distinguished from falsehood? Counterfeits are commonly allowed to prove that there is a true coin. But at least, it may be said, such passages prove that there is a criterion of truth in the mind which is above miracles. Yes, as far as that criterion can go, — to questions of simple right and wrong, — and to the rejection of every commission that should violate those simple dictates of truth, — but not to matters that are above and beyond all this. Here, in fact, the moral sense is not a criterion. It defines the basis of belief, but not the superstructure. If indeed the superstructure is such as destroys the basis, we cannot hold to it. But if the superstructure fairly and firmly stands on the basis, then it is not for us to say how high it shall rise. Now the special commission to teach is from heaven, — and the revelation is *of* a heaven, — and these are matters far above our reach. And when these matters are attested by miracles, will any man say that his moral sense can properly come in, and pronounce whether these things are so or not? Again; it is said that signs and wonders are slightly spoken of in the New Testament, as things which an evil and idolatrous generation seek. But even if miracles are meant in these cases, nothing would be proved to their prejudice. The desire to see them might be a vain curiosity; but the things themselves might be none the less valuable for that. But once more; it is said that miracles were wrought by those who had no commission to teach, — no commission from heaven of any kind. It does not appear to me that any such thing can be proved. There were exorcists among the Jews. Who believes that they had any *power* to exorcise or heal? What proves it? Jesus says, "If I cast out devils by Beelzebub, by whom do your children cast them out?" An *argumentum ad hominem.* You believe in such miracles. Why then reject mine? But the disciples say, "We saw one exorcising in thy name, and we forbad him." Does it follow that the exorcist had the power which he claimed, or which the disciples may have supposed? But why then does Jesus say,

"forbid him not!" Because amidst the great objects of his mission, he did not choose to interfere with every petty prejudice existing among the Jews.

On the whole, then, and after all these cases are considered, what is the conclusion? Why, here stands the plain fact, that *Jesus did appeal to the miracles he wrought, as proof that his mission was from God.* If there is nothing extraordinary, nothing supernatural, in that mission, what can be the meaning of such an appeal? If the miracles are appealed to, what is there in any pretended miracles, or in any bare *supposition* of miraculous powers used for unholy ends, to resist that solemn declaration? Here, I say, stands the fact. You cannot tear it from the record. You cannot reject it, without denying that the writers were credible and honest men. I do not merely say, there is no Christian theory, but I aver that there is no consistent theory, on which this religion can be received, and this testimony rejected.

"Who then can be saved? If it is necessary to sound the depths of the historical evidence, by which we arrive at the miraculous facts of Christianity, not one in a thousand does it, or can do it."

I answer, that it is not necessary. Fact is one thing; the philosophy of the fact is another. Men *do* believe in the Scriptures, and they derive all the essential benefit of believing, — they derive it *from their believing*, and not from a knowledge of all the historical or philosophical grounds of their belief. They believe in the obvious rectitude and beauty of the religion. They believe, too, in its miraculous facts; and there is a very simple chain of evidence that takes them back to those facts. Leland's "Method with the Deist" is a "short method," and most persons very well understand it. But at any rate, they believe; and it is not necessary to the beneficial or saving character of that belief, that they should be profound critics.

Nor is this distinction peculiar to Christianity. Men believe in the great truths of morality; but they do not understand the philosophy of it. There have been a dozen theories about morals; but still men believe in morals. They never studied the questions; but they believe in the things. So they take the facts of nature, and found upon them the whole prudence and practice of life; but, in general, they know nothing about their philosophy.

Do I say, then, that the philosophy is of no importance? By no means. It is very important and interesting to those whose minds have leisure and expansion to go into it. But I say that it is not necessary to effective belief.

"No, indeed, it is not," says some one. "I believe in the Gospel, because I feel its divinity. Not its miracles persuade me, but its spirit. When I commune deeply with the mind of Jesus, I feel that his words are the words of truth and of God." When you say this, you may be a very good Christian; but you are not a very good philosopher. In this sense, Rousseau believed. In an unpublished manuscript letter of his, which I once saw, he says to Mons. Vernes, a pastor in Geneva, "I believe in the Gospel. It is the most interesting of all writings. When all other books weary me, I turn to it with ever fresh delight. When the miseries of life press upon me, I resort to it for consolation." But was Rousseau a believer?

You say that you believe in the Gospel, on account of its obvious truth and beauty. Do you not feel the same thing, to a certain extent, in the writings of Fenelon? But did Fenelon come from God, in the same sense in which the great Master did? Nay, will you not say rather that you make a wide distinction? — that Jesus was an unerring teacher, — that there was nothing which he ever thought or felt, but it would be perfect guidance to you, — and that the seal of a peculiar and divinely inspired wisdom was upon him? Then indeed are you a Christian philosopher; but then, also, do you believe in a miracle. And what barrier there is, to separate this from the miraculous facts of the Gospel, I cannot perceive. There may be an ultra-spiritualism in this matter, but I cannot accept it as the full and comprehensive philosophy of revelation.

On the whole and in fine, let me not be thought to discredit inward illumination. In experience it is everything. The Gospel is nothing without it, — belief is nothing without it, — miracles are nothing without it. It is that vital believing, without which nothing would avail a man, — no, though one rose from the dead. That insight, I am persuaded, is to go far deeper than it has gone yet. It will reveal a yet unsuspected power of the Gospel, — a yet unsuspected application of it, to the heart and the life, — to all the questions about the problem of human existence and the providence of divine wisdom, — to the deep struggle after happiness, — and to the great welfare of humanity.

Let me now sum up the substance of this Article. I have gone into a detail, unnecessary I am sensible, and perhaps tedious to the theologian, but I have thought that the state of the public mind required it.

My faith, then, is the faith of supernaturalism. This faith, properly speaking, has no relation to the self-evident truths of the Gospel. These are to be entirely laid out of the case and the question. They are not things to be proved at all; they are previously established certainties. The faith of supernaturalism relates to a special divine mission, and to certain truths or facts which are out of the reach of human consciousness and intuition. To say, for instance, that Moses did not work miracles to prove any speculative truth, is nothing to the purpose. He wrought miracles to prove his divine commission. To say that miracles do not prove such a mission, but the mission the miracles, is absurd. And to the establishment of such a claim, miracles are *pertinent* evidence; and to this end, they must be not illusory or seeming, but real miracles; that is, real deviations from the order of nature. Now, no man can deny that there may be such deviations; and our ignorance of nature is no more an argument against believing, than it is for it. The question, then, is open for evidence; and the question, be it remembered, is not about knowing, but about believing. I do not *know* that Jesus wrought miracles, but I firmly believe it. Why? Because he constantly asserted it; because his Apostles constantly attested it. But why do I confide in the Apostles? Because I believe that they were honest men. Is not their honesty, then, the first link in the chain? Yes; but the last link is miracles. But how do I come at this conviction of their honesty! Not by intuition, but by evidence. A world of evidence satisfies me that they were true men, and that they truly attested these miraculous facts. I believe them. No ingenuity of criticism, nor vague dreaming about prodigies and false miracles, can erase those facts from the record. What, then, have I in this record? A communication of inexpressible interest,—a voice from heaven! On any other hypothesis, what have I? A mere book of natural religion, overlaid with a parcel of absurd stories. Between these suppositions I cannot hesitate which to choose, as the philosophy of my religion.

O. D.

ART. VII. — *Sixth Annual Report of the Trustees of the State Lunatic Hospital at Worcester.* December, 1838. Boston: Dutton & Wentworth. pp. 88. 1839.

WE have derived so much gratification from the perusal of this report, that we hasten to lay before our readers what strike us as its most important and interesting parts. A report with its statistical tables and array of figures, like a sermon with its formal divisions, is very apt to be looked upon as dull reading, and so thrown aside, and by those very persons, perhaps, who are most concerned to be made acquainted with its contents. We can, however, assure such persons, that if, overcoming this repugnance, they will take up the volume of sermons they may perchance have thrown down, and read, they will often find under the form of the sermon, — as in the late volume of Mr. Dewey, — some of the noblest essays in our language. So, too, under the duller and harder title, as it seems to us, of a report, will they sometimes discover learned and eloquent disquisitions upon subjects of deepest interest to the man and the Christian, — as in that brilliant treatise upon common school education, by the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, which solicits the reader under the winning title, "Board of Education, 1839. Senate, No. 13."

This sixth report of the trustees of the Worcester Asylum claims attention for the facts which it presents, and the beautiful picture it sets before us of the successful operation of an institution, in which the whole community takes a deep interest. What it has done, and is doing, should be widely known, and it is our object, in this article, to do our part, in giving what circulation we can to the facts and statements presented in the report; first, of the chairman of the trustees, Mr. Mann, and secondly, in that of the superintendent of the Hospital, Dr. Woodward. Our article will consist of little more than extracts from these two documents.

Mr. Mann, after a brief account of the prosperous condition of the institution, and a well-earned commendation of the liberality and promptitude of the legislature in their conduct towards it, makes this general statement of results, obtained from the minute and interesting tables of the superintendent.

"During the six years," he says, "of the existence of this

hospital, eight hundred and fifty-five insane persons have partaken of its remedial treatment. Of this number, three hundred and forty-four have recovered their lost reason. The residue, with few exceptions, have been reclaimed from a state of nakedness and filth; from ferocity, which assaulted relatives and friends with deadly intent; from melancholy, which poured itself out in continual tears, to a quiet, an orderly, and, to a great extent, a cheerful community, observant of the decorous usages of civilized life." — pp. 4, 5.

But this result, great and delightful as it is, he considers hardly superior to another, less obvious, but not less useful or real, namely; the change which, by the successful treatment of the insane within the walls of the institution, has been wrought in the prevailing ideas relating to the origin of insanity, — as inflicted by the hand of God, — and consequently to its curability.

"The preëminent skill and success of the superintendent of this institution," says Mr. Mann, "manifested for the benefit of so many of our fellow-beings, and in the midst of us all, have effected a deep change in public opinion. They have demonstrated that insanity is a physical disease; that it has its origin in certain natural causes, being induced by a violation of some of the organic laws, upon which mental functions depend; that these causes are not mysterious and inscrutable in any peculiar sense; that they are capable of being recognised and understood, like the causes which bring on consumption or the gout; that insanity is a curable disease; that it is a disease far less dangerous to life than fevers usually are; that the means of effecting its cure have been graciously put into our hands; and finally, that not only the means of cure, but the ways of prevention, in ordinary cases, have been entrusted to us, accompanied by the responsibility of rightly using them. Insanity, therefore, is no longer to be looked upon as some vast, unknown, and awful minister of evil or judgment to mankind; as dreadful for its mysteriousness as for its actual terrors. It is not an evil to which one person is as much exposed as another; or to whose assaults any one is equally exposed at all times, and under varying circumstances. It is a calculable agency. We see why it befalls, and how it may be averted. We see, that, should we all obey certain laws, which are annexed to our being, and are the conditions of enjoying mental soundness, we should be exempt from its power; but we also see, that, if we will transgress rules, to whose violation the dreadful consequences of insanity have been attached, it is as

certain to befall us, as fire is to burn. The excellence of these discoveries is, that they convert a disease, once most formidable and appalling from its uncertainty, into a measurable and calculable agency, — an agency whose action can be put aside, in most cases, by adopting certain precautions; or can even be repelled, when expending its force upon us, by the application of certain known remedies. They make known, also, that there are certain indulgences, whose continuance is an infallible mode of bringing the full severity of its woe upon the transgressor." — pp. 5, 6.

But though insanity is thus maintained and demonstrated to yield to the use of means, it is shown in the tables of Dr. Woodward, that their success, almost more than in the case of other diseases, depends upon their being resorted to in the early stages of the complaint. The results of these tables are thus brought together by Mr. Mann.

"The twelfth table of the superintendent shows, that upon the proper and usual basis of computation, the proportion of cures at this hospital, in recent cases, — that is, in cases of less than one year's duration at the time when received, — is ninety-four per cent.; while the proportion of cures in cases of more than five years' duration, has been only twelve and a half per cent., and in cases of more than ten years' duration, only three and a half per cent. Or, to present the same fact in another striking point of view, the proportion of the old cases, remaining at the end of this year, is about eighty-seven and a half per cent.; while the proportion of recent cases remaining at the same time, is only twelve and a half per cent. — p. 11.

These are very striking facts; and how urgent is the duty which they impose upon the friends of those who may show indications of this disease, to attend to its earliest symptoms, and apply in season the treatment, which, when applied in season, is now proved to be so almost certainly efficacious.

The chairman next classifies the causes of insanity; and, first, as to their power to induce the disease. Viewed in this light, the causes of insanity, in the eight hundred and fifty-five cases at the hospital, rank thus: — "1. Intemperance. 2. Ill health of all kinds. 3. Masturbation. 4. Domestic affliction. 5. Religious excitements. 6. Loss of property and fear of poverty. 7. Disappointed ambition. 8. Injuries of the head. 9. Use of snuff and tobacco. In a few cases, the cause of insanity is unknown. Foreigners and citizens of other

states found insane in this, have occasionally been committed, whose histories could not be ascertained. Probably we should approximate the truth very closely in distributing the unknown causes under the above heads, according to their relative proportions."

He next speaks of these causes as they are subject to human control, or as they yield to treatment. And here their order changes very essentially. Nearly one third part of the cases, which have been in the hospital from the beginning, are cases of hereditary insanity, and these are to a great extent beyond human control. Several other classes of cases are also stated to be almost equally hopeless, those, namely, which come under the heads of "ill health," "domestic affliction," and "religious excitement." But those causes which singly send the greatest numbers of sufferers to the hospital, Intemperance and Masturbation, are both within human control, and that immediately. Not that the treatment of the hospital can remove the disease, when once firmly seated, but that by private and public care the disease may be prevented in its approaches, or arrested in its earlier stages. The last of the two causes just named stands third in point of power to deprive its victims of reason. The statements of the report on this head are to us new, and fearful as they are new. We can feel not a moment's hesitation at presenting in our pages the results at which the superintendent has arrived, and which are found in his tables. If the State is to be at so great charges to erect and endow an institution like this for the reception of the victims, not of misfortune alone, but of vice also, and then sends out to the community in its reports the conclusions, which it has reached, concerning the causes which are secretly operating to crowd its wards, it is the least which the journalist can do to disseminate such information to the extent that may be in his power. If his pages will be read by any to whom the report itself would be little likely to go, they should then bear with them, if nothing more, an abstract of what the State, in its wisdom and benevolence, has deemed it right and proper to publish for the public good.

"The cause of insanity," says the Report of the Trustees, "which ranks as the third in point of power to deprive its victims of reason, is perfectly within human control, and that *immediately*. This form of insanity is suffered by the young. It differs from other forms, in two material respects. Before it is incurred, the way of

prevention is perfectly certain; afterwards, its cure is almost impossible. No one need ever suffer it, unless he so wills; but when once infatuation has brought it on, it is too fatal to admit a second offence. It is not only most certain in its activity, but above all other kinds of insanity, it stamps its victims with every abhorrent and loathsome stigma of degradation. Such is the nature of this dreadful form of insanity, and the singleness and certainty of the cause from which it proceeds, that we feel perfectly authorized to say, if medical men, parents, and teachers of youth, would do their duty on this one subject to the rising generation, this frightful and prolific cause, which stands the third upon the list in point of destructive efficiency, would substantially cease, in a single year. It is the vice of ignorance, not of depravity. The sufferers are, personally, less offenders than victims; but the welfare of the hospital and the interests of humanity imperatively demand, that something should be done to rescue the most moral, conscientious, and sometimes the most promising youth of the state, from the mind-wasting ravages of an indulgence, of whose terrible consequences they have never been forewarned." — pp. 9, 10.

Take also the statements of the superintendent.

"The number of admissions from masturbation, the last year, have been less, and the cases of a more favorable character. *Six* cases only are known to have arisen from this cause; but probably *three* or *four* others may have done so. *Four* or *five* of these cases have recovered, and have been discharged with such feelings of the nature and tendency of the practice, as it may confidently be hoped, will ensure them from future indulgence and its consequences.

"If, from this reduced number of cases from this debasing cause, we could indulge hope that the evil had diminished with the young, and that, as light is diffused upon the subject, the habit had become less common, it should encourage to perseverance in all the means which prudence and delicacy will admit, to exterminate a cause of insanity most fruitful in the destruction of every quality of mind and feeling which distinguishes man from animals of inferior creation." — p. 49.

In another place, Dr. Woodward bears this estimony.

"For the last four years it has fallen to my lot to witness, examine, and mark the progress of from ten to twenty-five cases daily, who have been the victims of this debasing habit, and I aver that no cause whatever, which operates upon the human system, prostrates all its energies, mental, moral, and physical,

to an equal extent. I have seen more cases of idiocy from this cause alone, than from all the other causes of insanity. If insanity and idiocy do not result, other diseases, irremediable and hopeless, follow in its train, or such a degree of imbecility marks its ravages upon body and mind as to destroy all the happiness of life, and make existence wretched in the extreme."

Spurtzheim, — that genuine philanthropist, — in his work on education, takes care to put parents on their guard in respect to this habit.

"Let them," (the young,) he says, "know the dreadful consequence of this vice, on the whole body, and on the manifestations of the mind. Incalculable mischief is done to individuals and mankind at large, by the abuse of amativeness. Many become insane, and, in numerous instances, mind and body are ruined, and all happiness undermined by its disorderly gratifications. Parents and teachers commonly are not watchful enough in this respect. A too anxious taciturnity of parents on these points, will rather do harm than good, because the propensity is innate, and acts without restraint, if its destination and the consequences of abuse be not clearly shown to children."

Intemperance, while it stands at the head of the active causes of insanity, is yet, like the last, susceptible of immediate and final suppression. Let the community and the individual do their duty, and not another patient need enter the walls of a hospital. It is here shown by Mr. Mann to deserve all the reproach that has been cast upon it, as one of the fruitful sources of human suffering.

"In all the ascertained and proximate causes of insanity at this hospital, intemperance stands out prominently and alone, as the most successful agent in the overthrow of human reason. One other cause, that of 'ill health of all kinds,' exhibits a small fraction more than two thirds as many victims as intemperance. The next most prolific cause is the one last above spoken of, and which is susceptible of being prevented at once. After these two, there is no other which sends half so many inmates to the hospital as intemperance. Here, therefore, we meet with a calamity, self-produced by the sufferer. He is not brought into the world, exposed, though innocent, to the sorest of human misfortunes, compelled to bear infirmities not his own, and to expiate offences, committed by his ancestors. But he is the voluntary procuring cause of his own fate; and the punishment he suffers looked him in the face, during the transgressions which incurred

it. But, though this fact ought to supply adequate motives to all for resisting this form of temptation; yet it is not so much on account of the sufferers themselves, as on account of others, that the trustees here refer to it." — p. 10.

The report of Dr. Woodward, the superintendent, consists of eighteen tables, presenting with great minuteness the whole statistics of insanity, followed by explanations, and remarks upon each. These are followed by accounts of particular cases, exceedingly interesting in themselves, and as evidences of the happy effects resulting from the manner of treatment adopted by the physician, but for which we must refer the reader to the pages of the report itself. We cannot, however, pass over the account given by Dr. Woodward of the results of the experiment of instituting public worship for the insane. It is a new and singular testimony to the power of religion over the human mind. The success of the experiment appears to have been complete. Religious services seem to have operated, in some cases, with a power beyond that which has attended the use of all other means, to subdue, into a temporary calm, minds, which before had raged in their wild violence almost without intermission.

"It is now more than a year," says the superintendent, "since we commenced having religious worship in our chapel. During that time, with very few exceptions, we have had *two* regular meetings on each Sabbath; more than *one hundred* sermons have been preached to our congregation by about *thirty* clergymen of different denominations. At the present time we have a regular chaplain. We have a choir of singers, who perform very acceptably every Sabbath; in the course of the season, from *thirty* to *forty* patients have belonged to this choir; on some occasions the music has been led by a patient; we have never less than *two*, and generally *three* or *four* musical instruments in our choir." . . . .

"The number of patients that have been in the hospital, since the chapel was dedicated, is three hundred and seventy-six, of which number three hundred and fourteen have attended religious worship. Of the one hundred and seventy-seven, that have been admitted during the last year, one hundred and forty-four have been in the chapel more or less.

"The number that assemble on each Sabbath, varies from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and forty, making, with our family, a congregation of from one hundred and seventy-five to two hundred.

"The order and decorum of these meetings have been to all who have witnessed them no less gratifying than surprising; the patients have, almost without exception, felt the importance of quiet and order.

"The power of self-control, which many excited patients have exercised in the chapel, during the hour of worship, a control which no motive could induce them to exercise elsewhere, is itself a most forcible argument in favor of religious worship for the insane.

"Many interesting examples might be given of the restraint which these occasions have imposed, which exhibit, in a strong light, the influence which our institutions of religion have upon the character of our citizens, even when insane.

"On the evening previous to the dedication of the chapel, a patient was brought to the hospital, who had been quite furious and excited for a considerable time; he was so much fatigued by his journey, that he went immediately to bed, and we hoped would be quiet and rest well through the night; after midnight he arose in great alarm, rushed to his window, and broke the glass as rapidly as possible. The disturbance which he made, aroused me and others, and we were immediately in his room; he was exceedingly agitated, and declared that enemies were breaking into his room, and he was fighting them off. He was placed in a strong room, and suffered to remain till morning. When I visited him in the morning, he was composed and peaceable; having learned that we were to have a public meeting in the chapel, he proposed to attend. I expressed some fears that he would not be able to control himself; but upon receiving his pledge, consented that he might attend. During the service he was perfectly quiet, and conducted with the utmost propriety; the next day he again broke his window on the same pretence. He continued considerably excited for some time after, but attended chapel every Sabbath, and conducted with the utmost propriety. He recovered favorably, and was discharged in less than three months." . . . . .

"Sometime in the winter, a young woman was brought to the hospital, whose mind appeared perfectly demented; she talked incessantly in the day time and most of the night, and there appeared to be no amendment in the case for a long time. One sabbath morning, while talking in her indistinct and rapid manner as usual, I proposed to her to attend chapel, more to see what influence the proposition would have upon her mind, than from any expectation that she would consent to go, or would command herself if she went. She expressed a desire to attend, and was permitted; she was perfectly silent and quiet for the hour, made

not the least disturbance, and returned regularly to her room; no sooner had she done so than she commenced talking again, and continued it till the hour of service in the afternoon. She again attended in the same orderly manner, and continued to do so for weeks, although the same disposition to talk remained. She ultimately recovered, and the first motive which was effectual to excite self-control, was the desire and determination not to disturb the religious exercises of the Sabbath. *The benefit of one hour of self-control, in such a case, from such a cause, is incalculable.* It is needless to add cases. If a stranger was to visit our congregation in the chapel, he would at first discover little worthy of observation; he would find from *one hundred and fifty* to *two hundred* people assembled together, quietly seated, neatly dressed, resembling in all respects an ordinary congregation." — pp. 75 – 79.

What a picture is this which follows!

"If, however, he was told that here from *eight* to *ten* homicides were mingled with the others, and *four* times as many other individuals, who, in their moments of excitement, had violated the public peace, or trampled on private rights when wholly irresponsible; that on his right hand sat the 'owner' of all things, whose self complacency will not be likely to be disturbed by any animadversions which may be made upon the character of the 'true God;' that by him sits the poet and commentator, who swallows every word that is uttered from the desk, and returns to write commentaries on the text which shall, at some future day, fill his purse with riches, and the world with 'celestial light;' that here may be found 'the King of England, the King of Heaven, the heir apparent to the throne of Prussia,' and the 'Prophet over Albany, who speaks from Jehovah,' and who daily expects the 'patroon' to send him a coach with black horses, to carry him to his friends; that here is also the military chieftain, the man of wealth, 'the rich poor man and poor rich man,' the mother of Christ, and innumerable other characters not less consequential; that here may also be found the laughing idiot, the perpetual jabberer, the gay, the passionate, the depressed, a hundred individuals with the delusions, impulses, and propensities of insanity, so active as to be constantly obvious in their conduct and conversation elsewhere, now listening with deep solemnity to the exhibitions of divine truth, uniting with apparent devotion in the fervent prayer, and joining with pleasure in the song of praise, — I say, could all this fail to astonish him? Can an hour, twice on each Sabbath, spent in this way fail to make the most favorable impression on the insane mind?

"What may not be expected, from one hour of self-control, brought into requisition twice on each Sabbath, independent of the instructions and admonitions from the desk?

"The more I contemplate this subject, and the more I witness this influence, the greater is my estimate of good from our chapel exercises.

"There is no community that observes the Sabbath more strictly than that of the hospital; no labor is done but what is work of necessity or mercy. Amusements are all laid aside, and the Bible, religious publications, sermons, and other appropriate books, are very generally read on the Sabbath, before and after worship, by the quiet and sober part of our family." — pp. 79, 80.

Here is another of a different sort, but almost as remarkable, of the order, regularity, and general comfort of the tenants of the hospital.

"While this paragraph is being written," says the superintendent, "with every room in this large establishment occupied, amounting in numbers to more than *two hundred and thirty* patients, but *one* individual, either man or woman, in our wards, has upon his or her person any restraint whatever; five only are in strong rooms in consequence of violence; the remainder of the strong rooms are occupied by imbeciles and idiots, because we have no other place for them to occupy.

"Of this number of insane persons, a very great proportion of whom were sent into the hospital "furiously mad and dangerous to go at large," *two hundred and twenty* at least sit at the table at their meals, use knives, forks, and crockery, like other boarders, and generally conduct themselves with decorum and propriety. At night, each has his bed, consisting of a good hair mattress, a straw bed, pillow of hair or feathers, and covering of blankets, comforters, and quilts, a bedstead, &c., as comfortable in all respects as lodgers in a private family generally are. It is rare that these privileges are abused; no injury has ever been done with knives and forks, comparatively little crockery has been broken, and the beds have been preserved neat and comfortable, with very few exceptions." — p. 59.

We cannot close our article without recurring once more to the Report of the Trustees. It is there shown, as has been already stated, that the cases of insanity arising from intemperance and masturbation, two of the three most prolific causes of derangement, while they are instances of insanity brought upon the individuals themselves by their own vices, are at the same

time the least curable, and of course occupy longest the apartments of the hospital, and the greatest number of them; yet it is these very patients, sent to its wards by the order of the courts, whom the institution is bound to receive in preference to all other applicants.

"It will be seen on inspection of Table 14, that the intemperate insane furnish a less proportion of cures, than any other class except one. Thus they occupy the rooms of the hospital earliest; they retain them longest; they virtually close the doors of the hospital against other cases of a recent date, and by thus postponing the admission of such cases to a later period, deprive them of the chance they otherwise would have enjoyed of a restoration to reason, to society, to their families.

"Now, were it not for the two classes last above mentioned, in which the insanity is caused by the misconduct or guilt of the sufferers themselves, the liberal means provided in the state would, in a short time, it is believed, prove sufficient for the relief of its insane citizens.

"In administering the affairs of the institution, a painful necessity has from time to time been imposed upon the trustees, of remanding to the jails and houses of correction of the respective counties whence they came, a large number of the inmates, in order to make room for the more ferocious, committed by the courts. In all, seventy-three persons have been discharged from the hospital, solely for want of room. This number is greater than that originally received from the jails, houses of correction, and poor houses, when the hospital was first opened. It will be seen, therefore, that the class of persons for whose relief it was primarily erected, and who otherwise might have participated in its privileges, have been excluded from time to time, to make room for two classes of persons, who have brought their insanity upon themselves, by their own misconduct or crimes. In removing a part of the inmates to give accommodations to the two last named classes, the trustees have made no discrimination between those whose insanity was occasioned without any fault or offence of their own, and those upon whom the disease was self-inflicted. This being a test not prescribed by the Legislature, they have not felt themselves authorized to apply it." — pp. 12, 13.

A regret is expressed in these statements, that by admitting to the privileges of the hospital the subjects of this self-inflicted insanity, others, upon whom it has fallen as a hereditary visitation, or as an effect of some cause over which they had

no control, are driven from its doors. "In the course of the last year," says Dr. Woodward, "a number of patients have been discharged for want of room, and more than ninety have been rejected from the same cause." This regret is the expression of a natural feeling in view of the circumstances, and we fully participate in it. It seems less than right, that, to make room for the drunkard in his raging madness, — brought upon him by his excesses, — those whose reason has been touched, as we may say, by the hand of God, or who have suffered the same dreadful evil as a legacy of some remote ancestor, or as an effect of any one of the various causes which inflict it wholly independent of any agency of their own, should be turned away. But the remedy of this injustice would not be found in committing another, — in reversing the principles of reception and exclusion. Because the intemperate have brought the calamity upon themselves, we admit at once is no sufficient reason why they should be abandoned. We feed the starving, though we know that indolence and improvidence have brought them to their sad pass. And we do right. We would fling the doors of the hospital wide open, as they are now, to receive the victims of intemperance, — not one should be driven back, — but we would have those doors made wider and larger, so that none should go away. The walls of the hospital should be made to grow till they can embrace every applicant. The State has done well; but this is no reason why it should not do better. In doing what it has, it has but done its duty, — no more. Nay, not its duty, while NINETY annually knock in vain for admittance. These public Charities should rather, we think, be termed public Duties. They are, rightly considered, the fulfilling of obligations; not the mere indulgence of benevolent sympathies. We like the doctrine, that the State is the parent of the people. It is a genuine part of republicanism. And it is only this, — that the people, in their collective capacity, will look after and protect themselves, so that the poorest brother of them all shall not want, for the reason that he *is* a brother, an equal, a man. The rest will take care of him. If this is so, and so we believe it to be, then this Worcester Asylum is but an expression of the care which the people feel it to be their duty to take of their suffering members; and while any are still suffering for the want of the necessary care, which they are so abundantly able to impart, they must feel that their duty is not done. This is our feeling as one of the people. And we

say, therefore, let the Hospital be enlarged to the requisite dimensions, or, if that be better, let another be erected at the other extremity of the State, at Pittsfield or Williamstown. The question of money, in such a case, is surely not one to be considered. If, as Mr. Mann affirms, the proportion of insane for Massachusetts is six hundred, — though that number he thinks is below rather than above the truth, — there are now more than two hundred residing probably for the most part in the back part of the State, dwelling many of them in prisons, jails, dens, and cages, for whom no provision is as yet made by either public or private agency. Let the same sense of duty which has built the Hospital at Worcester, double it, or build another in Berkshire.

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

A Description of the Principal Fruits of Cuba. By F. W. P. Greenwood. (From the second volume of the Boston Journal of Natural History.) — One of the pleasant circumstances in our situation, on the rocky shores of this bleak and sterile New England, is the ready communication we have with almost every part of the globe. Our cold winter, with its sharp winds from the north west, and still more the chilly east winds of our spring, may pierce and shatter the body whose tenant is too much engrossed by its moral relations to take proper care of the physical. But some one of the countless ships, which our wants and enterprise are constantly sending to every port, will, in ten days, place the invalid amidst the soft airs and delicious climate of those Indian Islands of the West, which more than realized the hopes of him who from Europe saw them first, as they have ever since the expectations of all who have visited them.

But fully to enjoy the delights of these pleasant islands, one must have had his eyes opened to see, and have learnt to understand and feel, the beauties of the field and forest at home.

Such preparation of eye and head and heart he would do well to make, who was about to journey to foreign regions, if for no other reason than the vast accession of pleasure, from seeing and comparing the varied products of varied climates. And he would be richly rewarded for his labor in that alone. Indeed the labor itself would be more than its own reward. For there is something about all the works of the Divine Architect, the

minutest as well as the most grand, that fills the soul while it occupies the mind. We can hardly, however, expect that, as a preparation for travel alone, the study of nature will often be begun. How can one, who has been insensible to its value as giving him access to the inexhaustible storehouse of facts for the meditations of the philosopher, of images for the fancy of the poet, of illustrations to the moralist, be expected to look to it as promising a new source of pleasure for a summer's ramble or a winter's relaxation?

There is, too, one objection to making this preliminary study of nature, for a voyage or journey undertaken for the recovery of one's health. There would be some danger, — a chance, at least, — of its making the whole work of preparation nugatory, by healing the disease for which the journey was proposed as a cure. If one set himself seriously to the work, — what with climbing hills and threading woods, strolling along river-banks and sea-beaches, penetrating forests to watch shy animals in their quiet haunts, anticipating the dawn, perhaps, to catch birds on their roosts, and see the first flowers open to the light, — especially if he were blessed with the luxury of a garden, and should undertake to transplant and cultivate, in order to study at will new plants, — there would be great danger that, amid all this business of preparation, he should unexpectedly find himself well. We should scarcely, therefore, undertake to recommend the study of nature, to the consumptive or dyspeptic or nervous, as a preparation for more profitable, judicious, and delightful journeying. To the fortunate man of leisure and independence, who, with predetermined will, should propose to travel for the purpose of seeing and enjoying, — to get wider knowledge of the infinitely diversified scheme of the creation, — loftier views of God's works and providence, — there might indeed be recommended some preparation of this kind, as most pleasant in the making and most fruitful in the use.

The description of the fruits of Cuba was minuted down during a two months' residence in that island by one, who, notwithstanding a true love of nature, had, by sedulous devotion to the ever wearing labors of the ministry, trenched too severely upon a constitution already twice before, when he had not as yet learnt to look upon the study of his Father's handiwork as a relief from care and a refreshment after mental exhaustion, weakened and almost broken up by intense application to his duties. Familiar with the productions of his native land, he found himself, in Cuba, surrounded by those which had the charm of novelty, alike to the eye and taste. Grateful for cool shade and refreshing food, he took note of the trees and fruits that furnished them.

On his return he completed his descriptions and read them, at different times, at the meetings of the Boston Society of Natural History. From a much larger number relating to the productions of the island, he consented to have a few, giving an account of the most valuable and characteristic fruits, published in the Transactions of the Society. In this little extract from the second volume of their Journal, we have the description of a large number of tropical fruits, given in the most unpretending manner, alphabetically, and yet under their botanical names, with references to their natural orders and affinities, and much of what is, in reality, though not in appearance, strictly scientific, and interesting to a mere naturalist.

We should be glad, if our limits allowed, to quote many of these descriptions, some of fruits already familiar, and others making familiar fruits before little known. We will at least give a part of the description of the Cocoa-nut tree:

"It is unnecessary to describe the ripe nut, because every child has seen and eaten of it. But it is worth a voyage to the West Indies, or some other tropical part of the world, to see this fruit hanging on its own graceful and glorious tree.

"The trunk of the cocoa rises to a height of fifty or sixty, and sometimes even ninety feet, of nearly a uniform thickness. It differs from that of the Royal Palm, (Oreodoxa regia) in always being bent or inclined, in never having a swell, and in being marked, along its whole extent, with deep notches or rings, which are the scars left by the fallen leaves, never obliterated, and so rough and deep that the tree can generally be ascended by their aid. At the summit of this trunk is a waving tuft of dark green, glossy, pinnate leaves, from ten to twenty feet in length, like gigantic plumes; and just under this tuft are suspended the nuts, in long bunches, of all ages and sizes. The trunk easily supports their weight, for though slender, it is very tough and strong, being composed of hard fibres closely compacted together. When the sea or the land breeze is passing through a group of these trees, and the light is glancing from the leaves which are all alive and trembling with joy, and the nuts are clattering on their stalks almost articulately, — it is something to contemplate by the hour, and to be repeated by the memory through a life-time." — pp. 20, 21.

It is not possible to read the book, without a longing and mouth-watering for some of these tropical delicacies. We were almost ready to repine that we could not be ill enough to have a voyage to Cuba indispensable to us. Indeed we should be quite willing, if it were not so particularly inconvenient to leave our reviewings and teachings so long, to be a little out of health for two or three months, so we might but sit under those same trees and eat those bountiful good things.

It is a trick not unknown amongst book-makers, to relieve occasionally the tediousness of their own prosings by choice bits of poetry from approved authors. If the writer of the "Fruits" did not assure us it was for his own gratification and not ours that he did it, we should suspect him of a something just the reverse of this, in setting in contrast his own rich and poetical prose, with the dulness and prosaicalness of Dr. Grainger's Sugar Cane, with extracts from which he sometimes regales us.

The conclusion is evidently given in kind consideration of those of us who are obliged to stay at home, that we may not be too much dissatisfied with our condition:

"I feel that I have enjoyed a great privilege in being permitted to behold the luxuriant forms of vegetation which Providence has allotted to a tropical clime. We have in our colder region no tree which can give any idea of the wonderful grace of the cocoa-nut tree; and the oranges, hanging amid dense and glossy foliage all the year round,

'Like golden lamps in a green night,'

offering to the thirsty lips their fountains of delicious and healthy liquid, are a glory with which our orchards can hardly vie. And yet, if I were asked how the fruits of Cuba compared with our own, I should say, that leaving out the pine-apple and orange, with the taste of both of which we are familiar, those fruits are inferior to our own. He who can begin the summer with strawberries (and cream,) and pass on through the varied season with his fair share of cherries, raspberries, peaches, plums, pears, not forgetting the hedge and field fruits, blackberries, thimbleberries, gooseberries, and whortleberries, have a peck or two of shagbarks and chestnuts dropped into his basket in the frosty mornings of November, and a few barrels of good apples rolled into his cellar for winter use, has no good reason to be dissatisfied with the fruits of his own soil, or to envy the inhabitants of Cuba the enjoyment of theirs." — p. 41.

An Address, delivered at the Odeon, before the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, January 14, 1839. By FREDERICK T. GRAY. Boston: Weeks, Jordan & Co. 1839. 12mo. pp. 24. — This sensible and valuable Address has been published in compliance with a vote passed by the Managers of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism in this city. This Society employs an agent, at whose office information is given gratuitously to the poor man or stranger as to where employment may be obtained; by whom places are procured for the exposed and dependent female; boys, beyond the control of their poor or widowed parents, are provided for in various ways, — and a union effected among the various benevolent Societies in the city,

by which means impostors are detected, alms bestowed with more wisdom and concert, and a vast amount of poverty and crime partially or wholly prevented. Its object we deem to be one of the highest importance, and is illustrated in this Address by statements and facts drawn from the experience and personal observation of its author, which demand the serious consideration of all those who are interested in the welfare of the poor or of their race.

Prevention of poverty and crime is the object at which this Society aims, — an object, as it seems to us, which is more and more to be considered by the wise legislator and the true philanthropist. In past ages, and in fact, at the present time, most of our benevolent institutions and laws, in regard to this subject, have no other or higher object, than to remedy these evils after they have been permitted to debase and degrade the individual, and to disturb the well-being of society. Worse than this; for *alms-giving*, in many forms, is proved by this Address to be not even a remedy for present suffering, but rather an aggravation of the evil. Self-respect is too often broken down by it, — while intemperance, idleness, cheating, and other vices are engendered or encouraged by street beggary, and other modes of eleëmosynary relief. The proofs adduced in proof of this are at once startling and appalling.

An extract on the effect of street beggary, especially upon children, will illustrate our meaning in relation to this single point, which, as the author remarks, should lead "every one to desist from giving alms at their doors, except to those who are known to them, — because, and we cannot but repeat it, they may by this means make whole families dependent upon charity, increase ten-fold their idle and intemperate habits, and be the unconscious means of training up children to moral ruin and destruction."

"Let me now show you the dreadful effects of street begging upon children, which this Society has it in view to prevent. Not long since, a lady in this city, in going up stairs, perceived her chamber door partly open, and on entering saw a little girl, of about twelve years of age, at a trunk, examining its contents. Upon hearing the lady, the child instantly took up a basket she had with her, and said in reply to the inquiry, what she wanted, that she was looking for a person who she was told lived in that room. Upon visiting the mother afterwards, she *expressed* great surprise; but she did not exhibit much *surprise* in her manner. But a short time elapsed before the name of this child appeared in the newspapers, as having been presented at the Police Court for stealing in a dwelling house. And this little girl was, and had been often sent out by her mother, to beg for cold victuals. The child is now at South Boston.

"A few weeks since, a little girl, with a basket on her arm, was met in the street by a gentleman, who knew the child's family well, when the following conversation took place.

"'Where are you going?' 'To get cold victuals.' 'Are you going to any particular house?' 'No,—I go to any house.' 'Where is your sister now?' 'She is at South Boston, at the House of Reformation.' 'How came she there?' 'Why, she went out one day, and stole some money from a house.'

Yes,—and that sister had been sent out by its parents to beg till she learned to steal, and when she was finally sent to South Boston, then this, the younger child, was sent out to do the same, and supply this indolent family with food and money, and she will no doubt soon be with her sister at South Boston. Now, if this child could get no cold victuals, nor receive anything at houses on her applying, would she go out? And, if she returned home day after day with an empty basket and no money, would these parents send her begging? We answer, without hesitation, *no*. Who, then, is encouraging that child, and these parents to continue in this evil habit?"

We can only say, in conclusion, that this Society has our warmest sympathy; and we trust that this address will be widely circulated, as we consider the facts which it embodies of the deepest import, in regard to one of the most difficult subjects which has engaged, at any time, the attention of the statesman, or the political economist.

The Women of England: their Social Duties, and Domestic Habits. By Mrs. Ellis, (late Sarah Stickney,) author of the Poetry of Life, etc. New York, 1839.—If the number of books, recently put forth upon the sphere and duties of woman, be a fair criterion of female improvement, then surely the women of our day are singularly in advance of their ancestors. At least, we may regard the number of such books as a token of the increasing interest felt in female education, and may justly hope, that a sense of the need of improvement will soon bring the improvements that are needed.

This work is not, what we supposed from the title, a description of English Women, but is rather a statement of what they should be. It is the chief aim of the book to honor and recommend the domestic virtues,—to exhibit woman, as the joy of the family, the angel by the bed of sickness, the light of the social circle, the exemplar of those kindly affections and refined sensibilities, of which Providence has made her so peculiarly capable. Herein, Mrs. Ellis makes decided war with two classes of pretended reformers.

First, with those champions of fashion and elegance, who have led the girls of our day to despise the good old ways of their

grandmothers, — to look upon all domestic labor as degrading; to ape the Parisian lady in dress, to fritter away their time in follies, and to think very little of a solid and useful English education, if so be they can get a smattering of French and Italian, play on the piano, waltz, &c. Mrs. Ellis mourns, that the daughters of England are becoming so Frenchified. She says, "the grand error of the women of the day seems to be, that of calling themselves *ladies*, when it ought to be their ambition to be *women*."

"Amongst the changes introduced by modern taste, it is not the least striking, that all the daughters of trades-people, when sent to school, are no longer girls, but young ladies. The linen draper, whose worthy consort occupies her post behind the counter, receives her child from Mrs. Montague's establishment, — a young lady. At the same elegant and expensive seminary, music and Italian are taught to Hannah Smith, whose father deals in Yarmouth herrings; and there is the butcher's daughter, too, perhaps the most lady-like of them all. The manners of these young ladies naturally take their tone and character from the ridiculous assumptions of modern refinement. The butcher's daughter is seized with nausea at the spectacle of raw meat, — Hannah Smith is incapable of existing within the atmosphere of her father's house, &c. &c.

"What a catalogue of miseries might be made out, as the consequence of this mistaken ambition of the women of England to be fine ladies! Gentlewomen they may be, and refined women too; for when did either gentleness or true refinement disqualify a woman for her proper duties? But that assumption of delicacy, which unfits them for the real business of life, is more to be dreaded in its fatal influence upon their happiness, than the most agonizing disease, with which they could be afflicted."

How far these remarks may apply to American women, the reader may judge. Is it not true, that French manners are making their way in our land, and moulding large numbers of the rising generation into characters, which, while they ape Parisian style, go just far enough to lose their true American worth, without gaining really the dearly cherished foreign graces?

But we must not forget the other class of pretended reformers, against whom Mrs. Ellis wars, — the *masculine* school of female education, — those who deem the *feminine* character despicable, and would tempt woman to vie with the ruder sex in the manly arts of life, and who regard the pulpit and the senate-hall as the noblest sphere of female action. It is not necessary to be very vehement in denouncing these, for they so war with natural proprieties, as to find condemnation enough in offended public taste.

The book is written to the middling class of English women, those who are exempt from grinding poverty, and overgrown wealth. This class comprehends the great body of our country-women, and they may find much to aid them in "The Women of England." The chapters on Conversation we would especially commend to their notice.

We here take leave of Mrs. Ellis, thanking her for this best work of the day upon a hacknied subject, rejoicing to see such a vindication of domestic virtue, by the author of the Poetry of Life, and owning in the fact a sign of those better days, when poetry shall be looked upon, not as a will-o'-the-wisp, to beguile people into mischief, but as the cheerful ray, that lights and beautifies daily life.

Address and Poem, delivered before the Mercantile Library Association, at the Celebration of the Eighteenth Anniversary. Sept. 13, 1838. — This Address was given before an institution of young men engaged in commercial pursuits. The object of their union is to promote mental improvement, by means of a library and instructive lectures. Such associations, when well conducted, must be the means of great good. They kindle a desire for knowledge among those engaged in active business. The Address, by Governor Everett, is another proof of his peculiar power. The Poem, by James T. Field, is superior to most productions, given on similar occasions. In its short compass, it shows much wit and pathos. The transparency of its diction, and the purity of its sentiment, stamp it as the production of a gifted mind.

Extracts might be given, to show the varied powers of the writer. We would congratulate him on the success of this, his first public attempt.

It is pleasing to see those, who are occupied in business, keeping fresh within them a love for the true and the beautiful, and thus showing to those around, that it is not incompatible with close application to the active duties of life, to cultivate a refined taste, and a love of letters.

Fireside Education. By the author of Peter Parley's Tales. 12mo. pp. 396. — This is an excellent book. We have read it with pleasure and profit, and we heartily recommend it. It is written with the author's characteristic plainness, but yet in a manner to make it generally interesting. The necessary abstractions of a treatise upon intellectual and moral education are

enlivened by stories, anecdotes, allegories, and quotations, which, while they illustrate the matter in hand, and give it point, lead the reader agreeably on his way, and allow him not to lay the book down till he has finished it. A spirit of religion, humanity, and genuine catholicism, worthy of all honor, breathes through the whole.

The Poetry of Travelling in the United States. By CAROLINE GILMAN. *With Additional Sketches*, by A FEW FRIENDS; *and a Week among Autographs*, by Rev. S. GILMAN. New York: S. Colman. 12mo. pp. 430. 1838. — It is now too late to do anything more than record our hearty concurrence in the favorable opinion which the public have pronounced on this pleasing and valuble contribution to the lighter reading of the day. Portions of it first saw the light in the Southern Rose, a monthly publication, edited at Charleston, S. C., by the accomplished author of this volume, of which we have long been seeking for an opportunity to say a good word. The Week among the Autographs is, perhaps, the most entertaining part of this agreeable *melange*, and contains information, which will surprise and amuse the generality of readers.

The Private Journal of Aaron Burr, during his Residence of four Years in Europe; with Selections from his Correspondence. Edited by MATTHEW L. DAVIS, author of "Memoirs of Aaron Burr," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1838. In two volumes, 8vo. — Aaron Burr was a man of talent; but unprincipled. He was one of the most remarkable examples, which this or any country has exhibited, of the perversion of great gifts, and the judgment of God on that perversion. As Mr. Davis has already given us his Life, and followed it by this journal, in two volumes, we hope that he has now done with him. We cannot say that we have given the books a complete reading; but from what we have seen of them, we desire to see no more. We are satisfied, and we cry enough. And we hope that those suppressed passages, which Mr. Davis talks of, have been, or will be, given to the flames.

New Works recently published in Germany. — We see that Messrs. Brockhaus & Avenarius, the enterprising publishers of the Conversations Lexicon, so popular in all lands, have com-

menced a continuation of that work, with the title Conversations-Lexicon, "der gegenwart" (of the present time.) The fifth volume was published in the latter part of 1838. The valuable Encyclopedia of Ersch and Gruber is advancing rapidly, and will form, when completed, the most valuable Encyclopedia ever published.

The subject of temperance appears to interest our beer-drinking brethren pretty deeply, if we may judge from the number of books they publish relating to it. They have their cold-water almanacs, temperance journals, and accounts of the progress of temperance in North America. Then, — since everything must have a history, — there appear "Contributions to a History of Temperance Societies;" next, a History of Temperance Societies themselves, by M. Baird, making a thick octavo volume. And, finally, there is a "Continuation" of this latter work, by another hand. Besides, there is a Temperance Conversations-Lexicon, and Hand-book. — Strauss's Life of Jesus still excites considerable interest, and calls forth numerous replies. Strauss's opinions are briefly as follows. There are fictions and mythical stories in the Gospels, which cannot be separated from the true history, if there is any true history at the foundation of them; therefore, no reliance is to be placed upon "historical Christianity," though the essential doctrines of the Christian religion are true as ever. Among the most remarkable replies recently published, are the following: — Theile zur Biographie Jesu. Ullmann Historisch oder Mythisch. Weisse (a follower of Hegel in Philosophy) die evangelisch-Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet. 2 vol. 8vo. Schaller, der Historische Christus und die philosophische Kritik, &c. Dr. Strauss's work has reached a third edition, (2, 8,) and he has published also a volume of replies to the attacks made upon him. Besides this, he has written a treatise on the Permanent and the Transitory in Christianity, in a periodical called "der Freihafen."

M. Salvador, an apostate and atheistical Jew, author of a work called Histoire des Institutions de Möise, has published a work upon Christianity and its founder, under the title Jesus Christus et sa doctrine.

Several important works are now in the course of republication, &c. There are two editions of Kant's collected works; the best one is edited by Rosenkrantz. There are likewise two editions of Winkelman's works now in the press. One comprises all his writings in a single volume, royal octavo, with sixty engravings. The other is in several quarto volumes. The second volume of Schleirmacher's collected works has been published, and the first was expected in the spring of the current year.

W. Von Humbolt's collected works have appeared in 6 vols. 8vo.

Several "Libraries" (Bibliotheken) are in the course of publication. One containing a translation of all the Greek Prose writers, another of the Latin Prose writers; others comprise the Poets of these two nations. Besides these there is a new Library of the Greek and Latin writers in their original tongues, accompanied with notices, &c. Lommatz has proceeded as far as the eighth volume of his new edition of Origen, in 12mo. All the German Poets of the seventeenth century are to be comprised in another Bibliothek. An undertaking still more stupendous has been commenced, viz. a Library of the collected literature of the German nation, (Bibliothek der Gesammten Deutschen National Literatur,) from the most ancient times to the present day. There is also a new edition of Luther's works, and a collection of the writings of the Reformers, (Corpus Reformatorum.) The last is edited by Dr. Bretschneider, and the fifth volume, containing the works of Melancthon, has just appeared.

Animal Magnetism is not forgotten in Germany. The Seherin Von Prevorst, edited by Justinus Kerner, — a poet and a physician, — has reached a third edition. The same writer has published two other works on the same subject, viz. Eine Erscheinung aus dem Nachtgebiete der Natur, (a phenomenon out of the night-department of Nature,) and Nachricht von dem Vorkommen des Besessenseins.

A sort of *furor divinus* seems to possess the translators of Germany, — who form a kind of third estate, between the writers and the readers. Not only do we see translations of all the works of Scott, Southey, and Byron, but of *all* the popular French and English writers. All the works of Bulwer, Capt. Marryatt, Mrs. Jameson, and the recent publications of Miss Martineau are presented to the German public in a proper Teutonic garb. There is also a translation of "The Bridgewater Treatises;" of the "Pickwick Papers," and "Oliver Twist;" and even the numbers of Nicholas Nickleby are done into German as fast as they appear. The productions of our own writers are by no means omitted. We notice translations of the writings of Irving and Cooper, an article by Prof. Silliman on the Scripture account of the deluge, and Dr. Warren's work on Tumors. All the works of Dr. Franklin, (5 vols. 8vo.) have been done into German. Translations also are advertised of Mr. Prescott's History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, and of a selection from the Papers of General Washington. The latter is edited by M. Von Raumer.

G. Franz intends to publish a catalogue of Italian works. One number has appeared of a series of yearly catalogues of the French Literature. It is similar to Heinrich's catalogue of German Literature, as published by Brockhaus.

Lecture on War. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. Boston: Dutton & Wentworth. 1839. 8vo. pp. 50. — The praise must be accorded to Dr. Channing of early and persevering fidelity to the cause of Peace. Others of the distinguished divines of the age have spoken out the strong sentiment of Christianity concerning it, in a single discourse; but he has reiterated his expression in various forms and on different occasions. Robert Hall, Chalmers, and Fox, the three remarkable names in the modern British pulpit, have each done worthily of their great powers and the great theme, once; Dr. Channing thrice. As long ago as the year 1816, when appointed to preach the annual sermon before the "Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers," he boldly stept aside from the established routine of expected topics, and pleaded with that large body of the servants of Christ the opposition of their Master's spirit to the spirit of military glory, entreating them to unite in helping his truth to triumph over that terrible evil. When, years afterwards, the controversy with France threatened for a time to end in bloodshed, he raised his voice again in remonstrance, and published his second Sermon. When the American Peace Society, eighteen months since, established a course of Lectures in Boston, with a view to rousing the attention of the public mind to a sense of the importance of this subject, he heartily joined in the plan, and at the expense of no little personal inconvenience delivered the Lecture which is now before us; and which has been published at this time, accompanied with a suitable Preface, because the recent apprehensions of a conflict with England have brought out fresh and sad proofs "of the insensibility of the mass of the community to the crimes and miseries of war, and a general want of Christian and philanthropic views of the subject." We are glad to see it in print; and we think that there were other lectures delivered in the course which might well be brought before the public. This one, certainly, ought not to have been kept from perusal; it is excellently adapted to make the right impression, and, in connexion with the former two, may be the means of opening many minds to the truth on this subject, which might else continue to slumber over it in stupid apathy.

This apathy, this lethargic indifference, is the great impediment against which this all-important subject has to contend. Till the

people wake up it is in vain to speak to them, and it is a most difficult task to invent the means of awakening them. A course of Lectures on almost any other subject, given gratis at the Odeon, would have attracted an assembly that should crowd the house; but the course on Peace was delivered to a comparatively thin assembly. During the discussion of the boundary question in February last, the Massachusetts Peace Society held two meetings in the Marlborough Chapel, at which eloquent and profound addresses were delivered; but not a large number of persons were collected to hear them; a large proportion of those present exhibited very little interest in the expression of the true peace principles; they even hissed some most eloquent and righteous assertions of Christian duty, while they applauded some clamorous declamation addressed to the spirit of vulgar patriotism; and the newspaper press, with but two or three exceptions, passed the whole proceeding without notice.

These, and a thousand other indications of a state of universal indifference, make us rejoice in the publication of this Lecture; we feel that we ought to call urgent attention to it, and entreat the friends of Peace to give it circulation. Its whole doctrine is lofty and impressive. It is that the evil of War is its wickedness and the crimes it engenders; and that it is to be removed only by the power of that religion which is to destroy all crime. Hence it is vain to trust to the temporary palliatives of political expediency, or commercial interest, whose superficial and selfish operations may excite to battle at one time as well as restrain from it at another. These points are illustrated with great force. The exposition of this general doctrine is followed by some considerations of the causes of the prevalent indifference to the subject. Another interesting portion of the discourse discusses the right of government to make war, and the limitations of the subject's duty to obey; — in the course of which occur some searching remarks on the character of political action, especially in our own country, which the thoughtful patriot must assent to, though with a sense of profound mortification and shame.

We break off abruptly; once more expressing an earnest wish that the friends of peace would give circulation to the seasonable word.

The Atonement: A Charge to the Clergy of the Protestant Epsicopal Church in Pennsylvania, May 16th, 1838. By the Right Rev. Henry H. Underdonk, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. — We cannot discover in this Discourse enough

either of originality or heresy, to give it the importance which seems to have been ascribed to it. It is little more than one of the countless and fruitless attempts to give a reasonable aspect to the Calvinistic doctrine of Atonement. Its peculiarity is that it makes the atonement to be "addressed to the *holiness* of God," and not to his *justice*, the more common view. How it can be said to be "addressed" to either of these attributes, how such attributes can be separated and especially opposed, or what light is thus thrown upon the subject, we are ignorant. The discourse does not enlighten our ignorance. It clearly rejects the old doctrine of strict debt, exaction, ransom, equivalent, substitution, and the like; — it evidently designs to frame something less repugnant to reason, common justice, and common sense. So far we welcome and commend it. But it still retains virtually the fatal error, that the atonement was designed to relieve God, rather than man. Some expedient, some sacrifice, some infinite suffering, was necessary to enable God to forgive even the penitent child and the obedient subject!

Speech of the Hon. HENRY CLAY, *in the Senate of the United States, on the subject of Abolition Petitions, February* 7, 1839. 12mo. pp. 42. — *Remarks on the Slavery Question, in a Letter to Jonathan Phillips, Esq.* By W. E. CHANNING. 12mo. pp. 72. Both published by James Munroe & Co. Boston. 1839. — These two pamphlets mark one step in the progress of this great discussion. The distinguished Statesman, in his high official place, sets forth the claims of Slavery to be perpetuated, without interference or end, in the Republic of the Free; and the friends of that doctrine celebrate his effort as eloquent and unanswerable. The distinguished Divine, in his private place of citizenship and philanthropy, rebuts that monstrous claim, and shows that the politician has argued weakly in a criminal cause. The friends of human right and their country's honor can ask nothing better than that the "Speech" and the "Remarks" should be circulated everywhere in company, and read together. The lists are fairly opened; the combatants are noble and earnest men, who have both deserved well of their country; let them have the unprejudiced ear of their countrymen, and the mighty truth cannot fail to be advanced.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

No. XCIII.

THIRD SERIES — No. XXIV.

JULY, 1839.

Art. I. — The Power of Christ's Moral Character.

The views of every body of Christians are very much determined by some prominent view which it takes of the Savior. For Christ, unlike the philosophers, did not merely teach, but lived out what he taught. Christianity was embodied in his life. He is the sun at the centre, around which all Christian truth revolves. The prominent ideas that we have of him must, more or less, modify all our notions of his religion. Therefore, in all ages of the church, the views entertained of Christ have been deemed, and justly, of the very highest importance.

But at the outset, we are struck with the fact, that, on this subject, men have been divided into two distinct classes; — one class deeming the metaphysical view of Christ the most essential, the other, the moral view. That is, one has deemed it of primary importance that men should have just notions of the *nature* of Christ; the other, that men should have just conceptions of his *character*. These different views do not exclude each other, and so of course have been more or less blended together. But still with each side, one view has been predominant, and the other subordinate. Whatever other differences relative to Christ may have existed on the surface, this has been the one at the foundation; and as men have embraced one side or the other, a different direction or different color has

been given to all their other views of Christianity. Therefore, and justly, we repeat, at all times, Christians have held correct views of Christ to be of primary importance.

Ever since the Apostolic days, the tendency has been to make the metaphysical view of Christ the essential and only important one. However a few may have felt, the mass of Christians have held the moral view of Christ wholly subordinate. Men have never been martyred, because they held too low notions of the Savior's character. His character has formed no subject for creeds. But creeds have almost always been filled with speculations as to his nature. To sustain particular views on this point, no efforts, no penalties have been thought too great. For this churches have hurled denunciations against heretics; for this the Inquisition has dug dungeons; and armies have been arrayed with hostile banners; and the sky of Christendom been made red with the flames of martyrdom. Christians often have not merely ceased to imitate, but have ceased to think of, the character of Christ, in contentions about his nature.

Now we do not doubt, we believe, that errors may arise as to Christ's nature, fruitful in evil results. But still we hold all speculations and all beliefs as to his nature to be of very small consequence, in comparison with just conceptions of his character. Many reasons might be given for this; but it will be sufficient for our present purpose to refer to two or three of them.

Had a definite and accurate faith in Christ's nature been necessary, we cannot doubt that it would have been revealed distinctly, as the doctrine of a Future Life is revealed. That it has not been so revealed is evident from the fact, that, for nearly seventeen hundred years, the question, as to what his nature is, has been agitated, and as yet does not approach to a settlement. And the fact that it is not referred to in the New Testament except incidentally, if at all, shows that neither our Savior, nor his Apostles, regarded it an important subject for us to dwell upon.

Again, speculations as to Christ's nature must be of subordinate interest, because it is one of those cases in which, (though positive errors on the subject, when made prominent as articles of faith and incorporated with creeds, might lead to much evil,) a knowledge of the truth could do little good. What has a belief in Christ's nature, whether it be understood to be divine,

or super-angelic, or angelic, or human, to do with a virtuous and holy life? He, who believes that Christ was subordinate to the Father, believes that the Father spake through him, and therefore that the commands of Christ are divine, and that all the truths and laws and motives he has given are divine, — resting on a divine authority. To the Trinitarian and to the Unitarian the Bible is the same and its authority the same. Though the Unitarian believe that the truths of the Gospel came through an appointed Mediator, he believes *no less* than that they came from God as their source; and the Trinitarian can believe *no more*. Whichever way one believe, every law of God for the moral and religious life on earth, and every hope of heaven are left untouched.

There is a still more important consideration. The making of a correct faith in Christ's nature the prominent thing disconnects our faith in him from the heart and conscience and life, and makes it a mere matter for the intellect. If we look at Christ's nature alone, we have in him neither standard of duty, nor object of imitation. The view is purely *intellectual.* Hence, as the intellect has to do with opinions alone, a correct *belief* came to be considered the all-important thing. And this mode of viewing Christ has fostered that monstrous error which has thrown a baneful shade over Christendom; namely, that intellectual opinions, of and for themselves, are of primary importance in religion. Hence creeds have been filled with nice distinctions as to Christ's nature, and assent to them made a test of fitness for salvation. Religion has sometimes been made a matter for the intellect so far, that while an Alexander VI. might be at the head of the Romish Church, and a Henry VIII. at the head of the English, he, whose intellectual opinions varied from theirs, though endowed with all the virtues, might be deemed, by the general sentiment of the age, worthy of martyrdom. This making of the metaphysical view of Christ the important one has done more, than any other single thing, to confirm that enormous evil of making opinion the standard of Christian attainment, — an evil which, like the folds of the serpent, envelops our religion and presses out its life.

But, instead of dwelling on the reasons that cause us to dissent from those who make the nature of Christ the important thing in a faith in him, we prefer to consider some of the reasons that induce us to attach a far higher importance to just notions of his character.

As on one side men have looked almost solely at the nature of Christ, and have elevated that to the rank of Deity, so others have vibrated to the opposite side, and thought that Christ, as a person, was of little importance in his religion. To us it seems that in his religion, Christ, — because of his character, — not nature, — is as the sun, the illuminator and interpreter of all that is dark. He is the living manifestation of all that it is most important for us to know in the spiritual world. In his character we see those things, which of all others, as Christians and accountable beings, it most concerns us to have knowledge of; the character of God; an interpretation of the moral laws of God; and a perfect standard of moral excellence. We shall make some remarks on each of these points, in order to show how essential in Christianity is the character of Christ, — how important the moral view of him.

1. In the character of Christ, the character of God is revealed. In the words of the Savior; He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.

Correct notions of the character of God lie at the foundation of all true religion and of nearly all true morality and moral happiness. It is so because the character of God determines all his laws, and consequently all religious duty and hope. Hence a correct knowledge of the Divine Being is the most important knowledge that a human being can have. As far as our conceptions of his character are erroneous, duty loses its true guide and hope is built on the sand.

But how are we to arrive at just conceptions of the Divine character? Nature has not at any time disclosed it to men. Where shall we go for light? To the Scriptures, — it is said, and truly said. There we are taught in the plainest words that God is just and good. But even here we meet with a difficulty. What is justice, what is beneficence? We must go to our own hearts for an answer. In them we find certain sentiments, to which we give the names justice and beneficence, and by these we interpret the words when made use of to describe the character of God. But how liable we are here to error. We see the Deity through ourselves; and just as far as our characters are corrupted and perverted, we shall mistake the character of God. We look at him through a distorted medium, and his character appears distorted. Each man, it has been said, makes his own Deity. To the hard and austere, he appears

as an inexorable judge. To the vindictive, his prominent characteristic will appear to be a readiness to avenge himself on his enemies. The tender and forgiving will see in him a God of mercy only. Thus every man's notions of Deity will be narrowed or perverted by his own peculiarities of character. We need something, when we endeavor to form just ideas of God, which shall aid us to correct the aberrations of our minds, occasioned by the unseen under-currents of our passions or defective moral feelings.

This aid we find in the character of Christ. The Divine Being seems afar from us. He is clothed in clouds and darkness. And mere abstract descriptions of him in words, often but the vague and indefinite symbols of thoughts as vague and indefinite as themselves, fail to disclose him to us. But what words could not do, is done by the character of Christ. In Christ we are taught that we may see an image of God. In him we see the Father. In him we see a perfect image of the perfections of the Father, and, what is all-important, presented in a manner intelligible to us. The character of Christ we may in some degree understand. He is brought within the circle of our sympathies. He is not merely described, but we see him act, and hear him speak, and behold his life. We behold him in the wilderness of the Temptation; we follow his steps through Gallilee and Judea; we hear his justice speak in his condemnation of the Pharisee and the hypocrite; we hear his beneficent voice beside the sick, the mourning, the dead. He not only requires holiness and justice and beneficence of men, but shows what they are, by acting them out again and again in almost every condition and trial of life. His character stands before us distinct and definite. And as far as we are able to appreciate the character of Jesus, we are able to form just conceptions of those moral perfections which belong to the invisible God.

How necessary it is to us, that the moral perfections of the Divine Being should be manifested through the life of one, whose character would be intelligible to us from the fact of its being disclosed amidst trials, joys, pains, sorrows, such as we are all subject to, may be illustrated by referring to the way in which we arrive at a knowledge of the natural attributes of the Deity, as for example, his wisdom and power. Could we imagine ourselves shut out from all knowledge of the *works* of God, and were we then told that he was wise and powerful, how inadequate

would be the ideas that we should attach to the words wisdom and power as applied to the Deity. Mere words could not convey these ideas. But let our eyes be couched, so that we might look abroad on the glories of the universe, and learn that the Being, who unfolds the leaves of the flower which opens its unnoticed beauty by the side of a forest stream, is the same who set the firm pillars of the earth, and kindled the undying flame of the sun, and established the everlasting circle of the stars, and the words wisdom and power have a meaning to them. The greatness of God is in some measure revealed. That is, we learn the wisdom and power of God, by seeing them manifested through works of wisdom and power. For the same reason, constituted as we are, the only way, in which we can arrive at any just notions of the character of God, is by seeing it revealed through character. Therefore it was in infinite condescension to our blindness, that God as it were stooped from his heavens, and humbled himself to our feeble comprehensions, and revealed his infinite glories in the softer light of the visible life of Jesus. Therefore it was, that he sent his Son into the world, not a mere prophet, but the image of himself.

Dim and vague as our conceptions of the character of Deity are, we cannot but think that they owe very much of the distinctness, which they may have, to the fact, that we have seen his perfections displayed in the life of the Son of God. The more perfect our knowledge of Christ becomes, the more shall we understand the perfections of God. The more our love of the Savior enables us to appreciate his excellencies, the more will the excellencies of the Supreme be revealed to us. Thus we may see the important meaning of the truth, that by Christ we have access unto the Father.

2. The character of Christ is the best interpreter of Christianity.

Christ is Christianity. In Christ we see Christianity alive, moving amid human sympathies, tested by trial, triumphant in death. God has not revealed himself through oracular and blind sayings alone, nor in such a way that it is necessary that a man should be a logician to understand his revelations, but merely that he should have human sympathies. And thus Christianity is a religion, not for the philosopher alone, but also for the poor and ignorant. And this helps to explain the fact, that philosophers have been the great corrupters of Christianity,

— explains how that poor woman, who, in the infirmity of age, in the midst of sorrows, sits in her hovel by her winter's fire, and slowly spells out the history of the Savior whom she loves and hopes soon to behold, knows, though she may not explain it as well, a thousand fold more of the vital truths of Christianity, than multitudes whom men call philosophers and divines. This poor woman has interpreted Christianity by the character of Christ; the philosopher has interpreted it by his philosophy.

We repeat, he who understands the character of Christ understands the very soul of Christianity. He understands not merely a few disputed dogmas on the borders of Christianity, but he stands at the centre and overlooks the whole territory. How, the question is often asked, how shall the humble and ignorant man understand the Bible? There must be some rule of interpretation, some key that will unlock its mysteries, which he can use and which will be sufficient. What is it? What must he do? Let him read the Gospels in such a frame of mind and spirit, that he may understand the *character* of the Savior, and he will have what he seeks. The poorest and most ignorant man, though he may have no other commentary, may thus possess himself of the best and of a perpetual commentary on all that the Savior said. He may take that character as it were a torch in his right hand to guide him through the dark places of the Scriptures. A text taken by itself may be difficult to be understood, but bring the commentary of the Savior's whole life and character to shed its light on this one dark point, and it will brighten and grow clear. If a man do this, it is as if Christ stood by his side with living voice to interpret the mysteries of his religion. To him who takes this course, commentaries and lexicons will be of little value; and he who takes not this course, all the commentaries in the world will not enable him to understand the Bible.

We are not conscious of the importance of the character of Christ in disclosing to us spiritual truth. Even when profiting from it we are not conscious of it. Take the life and character of Christ out of the Bible and leave only his teachings, and you would have left nothing but propositions as vague as those of philosophy. You would have only the shadows of truths: in Christ we see the truths themselves. Take the character of Christ out of the Scriptures, and you would take the Sun out of them. It would be like blotting the sun from this material

universe. Something might be seen by the cold light of the stars; but nature would lie dead; the green hill, the cultured vale, the shining river, colorless, dead, indistinct, with uncertain outline and deceptive shadows.

We do not mean to say that spiritual truths might not be disclosed to us in other ways. They have been variously disclosed. The truths of God shine dimly up from the face of Nature; they are suggested by human experience; before Christ's time they had been in some measure taught by human lips appointed of God. But these were all imperfect modes. Truth came to men only in a circle of vague reflections. Therefore God sent his Son, who was the truth itself in a human form.

Let us apply these remarks to one or two particular cases.

The character of Christ is the best interpreter of the doubtful doctrines of Christianity. Nothing will show this more plainly than a case which Fox in one of his sermons employs in illustrating the same point, and which is so much to the purpose, that we venture to use it again. It is the extreme case of a doctrine now to the honor of humanity not often believed, (though by necessary implication it still lingers, a melancholy monument of the past in the Assembly's Confession of Faith,) the doctrine of the damnation of non-elect infants dying in infancy. No one, we suppose, ever professed to find this doctrine, too horrible to mention, explicitly taught in the Scriptures. It is one of the conclusions of human logic, striving to arrive at something higher than what is written; one of those monstrous abortions of human reasoning, which sometimes make us ready to think that man's reason is, what it is so often described to be, not a light kindled in the mind by Him who rules in the heavens, but a treacherous lamp put into our hands by some demon from the abyss. But in rejecting this doctrine, we would go into no long reasoning upon it. We would bring it to the test of the Savior's character. We would hold it up against the brightness of his character, (and see if the two are consistent with each other,) who when on earth took little children in his arms and said of such is the kingdom of heaven, and who taught all who would enter heaven, that they must become as little children; thus making childhood, its innocence and faith and humility, the very emblem and type of the heavenly spirit. Contrasting the two together, we do not doubt, we do not argue, as far as we can know any thing, we *know* that the doc-

trine is false. Are we to imagine that Christ would plunge the innocent things which he held in his arms into perdition? No! Christian parent. The sweet child which you have lost and whose features shall never more on the earth kindle into smiles as it runs to greet you; which shall never again fly, a dove to its nest, to pour out its infant sorrows into your bosom, — that sweet child, long-lost it may be, but never forgotten, is sheltered by the embracing love of the Savior. But Christ is the image of God. If the doctrine be inconsistent with the character of Christ, then it is inconsistent with the character of God. And if inconsistent with the character of Christ and of God, of course it is false.

Or to take an example of Christian duty. A duty taught and explained through example is clear and definite. Taught in words only it must be vague. For instance: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Words could hardly make a duty more definite. But said the Jewish lawyer, "Who is my neighbor?" by this question covering the whole duty with mist and doubt. And it is easy to see how an ingenious man might explain and qualify, till he had qualified the soul of the commandment out of it. But bring up the character of Christ to illustrate the command, and we no longer doubt who are our neighbors. They are all whom we can harm or benefit.

3. In Christ's character we have a perfect standard of excellence. And in this respect its importance can hardly be overrated. The reason of its importance is easily seen.

Christ came to save the world. But how? By saving it from its sins. He came to save the world by elevating the character of the world. He came to save the individual by elevating the character of the individual. The whole object of his mission was to change, to elevate, to purify the *character* of the world. But how was this change to be wrought? It is answered, and of course rightly, by the truths he taught. But some having so answered, have also said, that provided we had the truths of the gospel it mattered not how, or in what way, they came to us. But to us it seems that to take the example of Christ from his teachings, to take his character out of the gospel, were almost like taking the principle of life out of the human body. Christ does reform the world by the instrumentality of truth. But he has given that truth its power over the character, by first having lived it, and thus taught it through his own character.

We are influenced a thousand fold more through our sympathies than through our intellects. The reading of all the moral writings of all the philosophers would not do us as much good, as the spending of one day in intimate communion with a thoroughly pure and good man. All abstract teaching of truth instructs the intellect; but in most cases it penetrates little beyond the intellect. As intellect acts on intellect, so character on character. The friend draws his friend to good or evil through the power of character on character. The parent's wise counsels weigh but little till they are taught through the life. Permit us to illustrate this more at length.

Go into a small village in the country. Here is a man who, from the nature of his business, is brought into connexion with nearly all around him. He is neither rich, nor wise, nor endowed with shining traits of any kind; but he has a pure and elevated character. In his dealings he is strictly honest. It is seen by all that he never will take advantage of the law at the expense of justice; that he will take advantage of no one's ignorance or inexperience or folly. The child, the most ignorant man, may deal with him as securely as he who understands the whole business. There is no ostentation about it. He is quietly, steadily, unostentatiously, because his own conscience tells him he ought to be, upright. He is more strict in requiring uprightness of himself, than of others.

He is benevolent. Wherever good is to be done and he has power to do it, he does it; not because others require it, but because he has a heart and conscience that require it. He seeks no praise or reward for it, but is grateful for the opportunity of doing as much as he can.

He is a devout man. He is not ashamed to be grateful to God for his blessings, but deems one of the chief charms of all blessings, the ability to connect them in grateful emotions with their source. In other words, in his family and in all the business of life, he is a Christian, openly, sincerely, gratefully, unostentatiously, a Christian man.

Do we say too much, in saying that one such man will raise the character of the whole village? Though he never say a word about uprightness, or benevolence, or religion, through the simple action of character on character, through the social sympathies, he will raise all around. His influence may be silent and slow, but it will be certain, and more powerful than daily lectures from the greatest philosopher that ever lived. It may

itself be unobserved; but it flows on like a still stream through the valleys, which is traced only by the greenness and fertility of its banks; itself hidden oftentimes by the very luxuriance of the herbage to which it has given nourishment.

But the influence of the good man's character stops not with those around him. He has children. And when he is gone they remember and honor him, and it is for his virtues. They have a standard of uprightness and truth and excellence ever in memory; a standard consecrated by affection, and made unchangeable by death. They go abroad into the world. They may hear that these virtues have no existence, — that all men are at heart, as far as they dare to be, selfish and untrustworthy. But they know that the world speaks false. The scoffs of the world at virtue fall powerless on him, who can go back to the grave of such a parent. They know that these virtues are real, for they have seen them lived out in a parent's life, and they know how noble and excellent they are. Blessed is the child that has such a parent to remember! Such a one knows that there is virtue on earth, and he will not doubt that there is an abode for it in heaven.

> "When by a good man's grave I muse alone,
> Methinks an angel sits upon the stone;
> Like those of old on that thrice hallowed night,
> Who sate and watched in raiment heavenly bright,
> And with a voice inspiring joy, not fear,
> Said, pointing upward, that he is not here,
> That he is risen!"

We may ascend to higher instances. The lives of Oberlin and Howard have given a greater impulse to active benevolence, than all the treatises on the duty of benevolence ever written. The Christian integrity of Wilberforce gave support to the halting virtue of politicians in his own time, and will not cease to give it. And the most intolerant thing on earth, religious bigotry, dooming all outside one's own sect to destruction, has been rebuked and had its theories overthrown and its denunciations silenced, by reading the life of such a man as Fenelon. Such men are the world's treasures. Every such character that appears is a pulse of life, that beats on and quickens with a new vitality the lethargic virtue of society. It is as true as in days of old, that ten righteous men can save a city. It is almost miraculous — the power of a righteous life. As the words of a wise man act on the minds of others, the life of a

good man acts on their souls. Its influence is shed abroad into the hearts of friends, and through them, in ever enlarging circles, into the hearts of others. The man, the community, the state, which has a truly righteous man to look up to as an elevated and pure standard of character, has a possession worth more than philosophers, and rhetoricians, and overflowing treasuries. Truth is powerful; but truth, lived and acted out, and so placed that it may be seen, is omnipotent. She then has a divine power. Men may band together, and with force, for a time, drive her aside from the world, and imprison her in dungeons, but she converts the very jailers that keep watch over her, and sends them forth her ministers and apostles. Foes may arm themselves, Pilate and Herod may come together, and enter into alliances against her, and slay her followers, and pierce her sacred body with wounds, — they may wrap her in her winding-sheet and lay her in the grave and set armed bands to watch over her sepulchre; but the very earth shall open to give up the dead, and she stand forth again, a living and immortal creature.

The examples, to which we have referred as illustrating the power of character, are but feeble emblems of the moral power of the character of Christ. He stands before the world, not merely the image of God, but the standard of perfected humanity. In him perfect moral excellence is embodied, and by being embodied is made distinct, clear, definite, to the world's eye. Henceforth the world's ideas of moral excellence are as much more distinct, as would be one's conceptions of a work of art, who, having only read some vague description of it in words, should afterwards see it embodied in the chiselled and polished marble. The fact that one perfect character has appeared, where it might be seen, has cleared up and rendered definite the world's notions of moral excellence forever. The passions of men seeking apology for indulgence, the customs of different nations and ages, the conflicting theories of philosophers, all disturb and confuse and cloud over our notions of moral excellence. But above these broken and drifting clouds, the character of Christ stands and shines fixedly like a star. If we look only around us in our voyage over life, instead of fixed landmarks, we see only night, and storm, and breaking waves. We look upward, and there shines that constant, tranquil, eternal light to guide us across the seas.

Let one living, perfect standard of excellence be raised aloft

so that all may see it, and the world unconsciously measures itself by it. Some looking at that perfect example, revere and love, and through reverence and love ascend towards it, and others follow them. All feel a gravitating power raising them upward. That ideal standard gives a coloring to literature, it modifies philosophy, gives direction to men's views of life and its objects, and affects, more or less, all human institutions. Its influence must indeed be gradual and slow. To change the ideas and institutions and habits of thought and feeling of the world, must be the work of ages. But the influence of such a standard is certain. It acts like the mild influences of the spring as they come to the frozen coasts of the North. Slowly but certainly the ice melts away, and the snows disappear, and the earth's heart is warmed, and bud and leaf and blossom unfold under the gentle breath of the South. The power is mild, equal, but irresistible, like the power of God. Tempted, frail, sinful as we certainly are, forgetful of Christ as we may be, we still cannot but think that the existence of his character, as a reality, and a perfect standard of virtue and holiness, raised before the eyes of the world, (though we may have been unconscious of its influence,) through its great power over the character of a few, and its direct or indirect influence on all, has more than anything else given power to Christianity, and though slowly and interruptedly, yet certainly, been ever elevating the character of Christendom.

But where has the power of his character been seen? We answer, it has been seen from the beginning. It was in that glance which sent Peter forth to weep bitterly. It awoke that remorse in the heart of the betrayer, which made him fly to self-destruction as a refuge from self-reproach. The centurion bore witness to it, when he saw in him, who was dying on the cross, a Son of God. It took its ignominy from the most degrading mode of punishment. It transfigured the very cross itself, till what was associated with the lowest infamy, has become the emblem of highest hope. It is because of that character still shining from it, that the cross is sacred to all time, — that it towers over churches, and is reared above altars, — that living men kneel before it and dying men clasp it to their bosoms. It is not his words, merely, but his living example, that has raised up thousands of martyrs to human good, and has caused thousands with words of forgiveness on their lips, to die calmly at the stake, not for fame, not for their country, not for their

friends, but for the good of their foes. The world's great spiritual benefactors, when the scorn and persecution of men lay heavy on them, have repeated his words, Thy will be done; and, as if an angel had been present to strengthen them, have felt new fortitude. And when persecution has ended in death, from the midst of the furious crowd they have looked up to the calm and open heavens and said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." In all times, they, who have gone to the heathen with the gospel in their hands, have carried the image of Christ in their hearts. Nothing is more remarkable than the manner in which those, who have been most earnest and hearty in the highest Christian enterprises, have connected their labors and hopes with Christ himself. They have been not merely students of his *words*, but followers of *him*. They have labored for *him*, they have been cheered by the promise that he would be with them, — they have loved him, died for him, and hoped to meet him in heaven. Had the gospel only been written, it would have addressed the intellect and been mainly a matter for intellectual speculation. By living out the gospel under the greatest trials, Christ has met one of the great wants of human nature. He has connected inseparably the truths of the gospel with the emotions and affections of men. Had the gospel been only taught as philosophy, it might still have been so taught. But there would have been no missionary, and no martyr to human welfare, unless Christ himself had first been a missionary and a martyr.

All the labors for human improvement, that now cover Christendom with its true glory, are but streams flowing out more or less directly from the fountain of Christ's example. His life and his death gave the first impulse to this laboring for human good. His words indeed, but his example still more, taught the essential equality of all men, — that under purple robes and under beggar's weeds is the same human soul, having the same essential rights and destiny. He first of all trampled down the dividing lines of caste and nation, and proclaimed the great idea of modern civilization, that all men are children of one God, and made to be brethren.

In acting out these great principles, the influence of Christ is seen producing the grandest and most striking results; but we may see it with equal distinctness in particular cases and in humbler things. How much has the estimation, in which men hold the duty of benevolence, been elevated by seeing Christ

die to accomplish a work of unmixed beneficence. How many words of forgiveness have been prompted by the dying words of Christ. The mother that mourns the loss of her child, looks to him in her time of desolation; she remembers how he blessed children on earth, and in the midst of her tears, how is her heart soothed as with the eye of faith she sees her dear one still blessed by him in heaven. The dying man, as the shadows lengthen and all earthly lights grow dim, does not speculate on immortality; but to soothe his fears, he looks to him who died and was laid in the grave, yet now lives, the first fruits of them who slept.

But we need not go to such extreme cases to see the influence of Christ. His example, whose presence brought a holier light to the marriage of Cana, and consolation to the mourning sisters of Lazarus, who taught, by his example, the powerful, that their highest office was to become the benefactors of the humble, who taught the rich for his sake to give to the poor, and went a self-invited, but blessed guest, to the tables of penury; his example has modified all the relations of society. It has brought high and low together, and united them in the bonds of a living sympathy. In heathen lands, before Christ's time, there were rich and poor, high and low, but they were separated by almost impassable barriers. Scenes of mutual sympathy, of kindness and thoughtfulness and self-forgetfulness and trust in trial, that now every day are enacted in every street, bringing the extremes of society together in holiest bonds, were then all but unknown. Such scenes are too rare among us, but still they exist, and in them we see the following out of the example of Christ.

Go abroad in some great city, in the night. Behold before you. Brightly shine the lights in that stately mansion where pleasure has collected her votaries. The dance, the song are there, and gay voices and exultant hearts and fair features that grow fairer in the excitement, and all goes merry as the marriage bell. And most natural and fitting is it that the hearts of the young should glow with vivid pleasure in the whirling and dazzling scene.

But here is but a part of the scene. At this very moment within sight of the brilliant windows, within the sound of the rejoicing music, sits in her dreary room, a widowed mother; and to her frame, consumption has brought its feebleness, and to her cheek its flush, and to her eye its unnatural light. Her

children sleep around her, and one that ever stirs with the low moanings of disease, slumbers fitfully in the cradle at her foot. Her debilitated frame craves rest, yet by the light of a solitary lamp, she still plies her needle that her children may have bread on the morrow. And while she labors through the lonely hours, her sinking frame admonishes her that this resource soon must fail them, and she be called away and leave her children alone. And while her heart swells with anguish, the sound of rejoicing comes on the wind to her silent chamber. Not one of all that gay circle whose eyes will not close before hers this night! One by one the wheels that bear them to their home depart, — the sounds of mirth and pleasure grow silent in the midnight hours, — the lights of the brilliant mansion are extinguished; but still from her chamber shines her solitary lamp. The dying mother must toil and watch!

All this in substance might have been seen before Christianity, in Athens or in Rome. But there is something more which may be seen every day in a Christian city. And it shows how Christianity has modified all social relations, softening the pride of the high, making those tempted to daily self-indulgence, self-forgetful, and giving hopes high as heaven to those that sit in the darkest places of earth.

With the morning, and brighter than its footsteps upon the mountains, behold one of that gay throng, in the bloom of youth and fitted to be the idol and the envy of gilded drawing rooms, has left her home, — she has entered the narrow lane, and opened the door of that obscure chamber. She has gone to sit with this poor widow, to carry her needed aid, to watch for her over her fretful child, and to whisper to her the sweet words of human sympathy. Blessed is she who can thus forget herself, and find her highest happiness in carrying happiness to those who sit unfriended and alone. And the heart of the lonely mother is warmed by her coming, — for blessed to the desolate is the fresh sympathy of the young and happy! She is no longer alone. They have a common hope. They can bend together before the same Father, they read the same gospel, they visit the cross together, and together watch at the tomb on the morning of the resurrection.

And when she is again left in her lonely chamber, she is not alone. As her visitor retires, grateful thoughts of human sympathies linger behind, like sunset in the air. The sense of God's kind providence rests on her soul. To her faith, the

distant are brought near, and the dead live, and await her coming to a better land. Her mind goes forward to the future. She rises above the clouds. Serenely shines the sun. Gently falls the love of God on her heart. Sitting amid trials and darkness and the ruins of earthly prospects, with calm spirit "she builds her hope in heaven." The prosperity, the adverse fortunes, the joy, the grief, all this might be seen in every age. It is Christianity that has brought sympathy to suffering, hope to the bereaved, and resignation to the afflicted; which has brought light to dark hours, and faith in heaven to those that dwell amid the sorrows of earth. It is Christianity that has softened and melted the ice of prosperity, which has smitten that rock and made it a fountain of living waters to those that dwell in the valleys below. It brings all classes together. The day-spring from on high, as it rises over the world, glances on every height, it illuminates every depth, it reveals all to each, and by its universal light shows all to be brethren living on the bounty of one and the same God.

We have thus endeavored to state some of the reasons that induce us to dwell on the character, rather than on the nature, of Christ. However important it may be to have a correct faith as to the nature of Christ, as to his metaphysical constitution, we deem it of infinitely higher moment that we should have just and abiding conceptions of his character. Through his character, as through a glass, not darkly, we see all those spiritual truths that it most concerns us to know. Through his character, (not his nature,) God, the moral governor, reveals himself. Through his character the spirit of truth and of heaven are made manifest. In his character we see the character of heaven, — that character towards which we must approach, and with which we must have a true sympathy, or the happiness of heaven cannot be ours. It is because of these reasons that we attach such importance to just ideas of the Savior's character. We deem them of as much more importance than mere speculations about his nature, as we deem a Christian character in ourselves of more importance than any metaphysical speculations about our own natures. The nature of Christ furnishes for us little except matter for metaphysical speculation: but his character is connected with our highest happiness on earth, and our holiest hopes of heaven. It is because of this, that the apostles dwell so much on the necessity of faith in Christ, — not faith in speculations about his

metaphyical constitution, not faith in some creed about his nature, but faith in that which is the glory and crown of his nature, faith in his moral excellencies, faith that he was the image and appointed manifestation of the Father, faith in his truth, faith in his character as the perfect standard of heavenly excellence.

Therefore they require faith in *Christ crucified*, because on the cross, from amidst its scorn and agony, from amidst the tumult of men below and the darkened heavens above, shone forth over the world that character with brightest beams.

Therefore would they ever carry us, not to his words alone, but to himself, — they would have us see him, follow him, as our benefactor, leader, Savior; as that star in the East, which moves on ever with steady light to guide us to salvation.

Art. II. — The Christian Citizen.

It is an object of great interest and importance to inquire what is the duty of a religious man in regard to political subjects.

The quiet citizen, who pursues his own occupation without interfering in public matters, will find himself secure under any form of government. Whether an absolute prince governs his country, or whether its rulers are subject to the control of a majority of the people, he can still retain his rights, practise his profession, and reap its profits; merely yielding an obedience to the laws of the country which habit renders easy. He does his duty as an individual, and performs his part with as much faithfulness, whether he lives under a democracy or an autocracy. He is as happy as government can make him, as long as the laws preserve his property from violation. It is principally the restless and ambitious men who are, or wish to be, in public life, that are injured or troubled by oppressive forms of government.

A man, who thus pursues his own quiet path, is certainly far happier than he whose interest in public affairs keeps him constantly uneasy, because those who have the administration act

in opposition to what he believes to be right. Few, we believe very few, could be found who have derived any real happiness from political life. We are afraid there are few public men who are influenced by a pure love of their country. However honorable may have been their original motives, these motives are gradually lost sight of. The politician even when he thinks his motives are pure, is seeking his own aggrandizement, and, without his being aware of it, ambition and self-interest are gradually taking a stronger possession of him. He believes that in endeavoring to acquire popularity, or in forwarding the interest of his party, his only object is the welfare of his country. He soon finds, however, that those around him are seeking their own elevation under cover of public spirit, and he begins to doubt the existence of pure motives. There are others of a disposition naturally more selfish, who have so often expressed the disinterestedness of their views, that they have succeeded in imposing upon themselves. This is no theoretical or imaginary view, — it is fact.

In times of danger, men become excited by higher motives. Men of integrity desert their customary vocations, one mind kindles another, the contagion spreads, and the nobler and more disinterested feelings are aroused in every heart. Thus war, insurrection, revolutions, great evils as they are, afford the means of developing the best feelings of mankind; so true is it, that in this world there is no unmixed good or evil.

It must be conceded, then, that a man may be happier who minds his own concerns and does not trouble himself about public affairs. But does he discharge his duties to his fellow beings in so doing? Next to the duty he owes his Maker, it is his duty to promote the happiness of his neighbor as far as lies in his power. Next to his own family, his own countrymen and those immediately around him, his own townsmen come within this designation. The true Christian, however, is a citizen of the world. Every human being is his brother. He will not aim at the advantage of his family at the expense of his neighbor; neither can he aim at that of his own country, to the injury of another. The whole human race are his brethren. He is bound to do nothing that can injure any portion of it. Still, as it is natural and just that he should love his own family better than strangers, it is natural and just that he should love his own country better than a foreign one. This love of country will never justify him in abetting injustice to-

wards a foreign state. Herein is the difference between Christianity and patriotism. Patriotism existed in its fullest force in a state of barbarism. It is among the most barbarous nations of antiquity, that we find the most remarkable instances of this virtue. In the mind of the true Christian, therefore, philanthropy will take the place of patriotism. This is a truly Christian virtue, the other is a barbarous one.

Philanthropy will naturally be best exerted upon those most within its reach, — those nearest home. Our religion therefore does not require us to love our country less than the heathen patriot; it only demands that we should love other countries also, even those which may be at war with us. A man can never be justified in taking part in any war except a defensive one. He cannot throw the guilt upon his rulers. If they have involved the country in a war, theirs is the greater guilt, but each individual is a moral agent, and responsible for his own conduct.

But to bring the question more nearly home to us. What is the duty of the private citizen in this country, in regard to public affairs? Can he conscientiously avoid taking any part in them?

Every citizen has the privilege of voting at elections, and if well disposed and upright citizens think they may neglect this privilege, the danger is, that evil-minded and ill-disposed persons will obtain power, and that power will be perverted to answer their own ends, and strengthen themselves in office by rewarding their partisans. The property of the nation will thus become the plunder of party. One of the greatest dangers of a government, like ours, arises from the fact, that in the very nature of things, the most disinterested will be and are inclined to neglect this privilege or duty, and the most active are those who have most to hope for from the success of their efforts. It is therefore the indispensable duty of the Christian citizen never to neglect this right.

But is this sufficient? May he follow the party in which accident has placed him, put into the ballot box the vote placed in his hands, and retire to his office or his counting room, without further consideration of the subject?

Nowhere, we believe, is the spirit of party more powerful, more tyrannical, than in this land of boasted freedom. The man who dares on any occasion to act in opposition to his party, is branded with the most disgraceful epithets. Faithful-

ness to party is considered as synonymous with patriotism. It is sufficient to supply the place of other virtues, and to cover a multitude of sins. But is this as it should be? Ought not the statesman to have perfect liberty to do what he conscientiously believes to be for the good of his country, without regard to the opinion of his party? It is impossible that men can take the same views upon all subjects, and therefore every man ought to be allowed freely to express and freely to act upon those sentiments which he believes right, even if they be in accordance with those of the party to which he is in general opposed. He may, it is true, resign his opinion when he clearly sees that it is more for the ultimate advantage of his country that he should do so, upon any particular question, in order to promote union upon other subjects, or to avoid useless opposition; provided, however, that in so doing he does not countenance what is morally wrong. What we contend for, is, that an individual should not be subjected to obloquy, because he dares to support an opinion opposed to that of his party, or his party's leader. We are much mistaken if cases have not occurred of the most sincere and independent men being loaded with execrations, merely because they dared to think and act for themselves.

It is *not* sufficient that the citizen should put his vote into the ballot box. He must go further. He must know for whom he votes, and why he votes for him. Unless he has attended to the subject, and is convinced upon sufficient examination, that the candidate for whom he votes is the one best qualified for the office, he has not done his duty,—he had better have staid at home. And in this examination he must be careful that he is not carried away by party feeling, and that he does not give credit to the falsehoods to which currency has been given for party purposes. It deserves to be recollected, as an illustration of the extent to which party abuse is carried, that a writer in a German paper, some years since, remarked that it appeared from the American newspapers that the two greatest scoundrels in the United States were candidates for the presidency.

It may, however, be the duty of the citizen to give his vote for that candidate, whom he believes to be the best of those likely to be chosen; because otherwise his vote is thrown away, or may even go toward a majority against this candidate, preventing an election, and perhaps favoring the ultimate choice of the most objectionable.

There is one thing, however, we would most earnestly enforce, and we want language to enforce it with sufficient energy. This is, that every honest and upright man, every sincere Christian, shall labor to promote the elevation to office of those, who have not only the requisite talents for the station, but who are likewise men of pure and unexceptionable characters in private life. We are well aware that this is not in accordance with the received political doctrine. We know that a political and a religious man are considered almost as opposite characters; that political management has come to be considered another name for fraud and artifice.

It is the received opinion, too, the opinion acted upon, though not perhaps expressly avowed, that strict moral integrity is an obstacle in public life, and disqualifies a man for acting as the interest of his country or his party requires. It is a solemn fact that moral, and, above all, religious men, are unpopular as candidates for office. Those of somewhat latitudinarian views are preferred.

As long us such ideas prevail, we may well exclaim, "There is no hope for nations."

As long as the maxims of Machiavel and of Chesterfield are regarded with any respect, — as long as the *pensieri stretti* and *volto occulto*, in plain English, consummate hypocrisy, is considered as the necessary attribute of the statesman, there is no hope for nations. The only preservative of the liberty of a republic, most particularly, must be found in the moral and religious character of the people. The rulers must be men of pure and unexceptionable moral characters, and those who elect them must be pure. Can we firmly believe in the sincerity and public spirit of those who are faulty in private life? Can we look for disinterested devotion to their country in those who are governed by ambition or love of wealth? Will those men be careful to avoid injustice toward a foreign nation, or toward a rival in their own, who are not irreproachable in their conduct to their neighbors? What is still more to the purpose, — can we be sure of the honesty of the motives of any man, unless we know that he holds himself responsible to the Being who reads the secrets of all hearts, and that he makes the approbation of that Being the ultimate object of all his exertions?

Let it be known that moral and religious worth are the essential qualifications for high public station, and the subordinates in office will be encouraged in the practice of integrity.

Man is an imitative being; the majority of our race do not take the trouble to think and act for themselves; they take their ideas of right from those around and above them. Few people, we believe, are aware to how great an extent this is the case; how far every one of us, even the most independent, takes the tone of the circle in which he is placed, and adopts their ideas of what is right or wrong. Men in public office give the tone to those below them, and in proportion as they show their regard for religion, honor, and integrity, so will their subordinates. On the other hand, if they are led to believe that ambition or love of accumulation is the governing motive of those above them, they will hold themselves excused in the practice of peculation, and of vices and dishonesty, from which their superiors are secured by want of temptation. They observe those in higher office seeking their own interest instead of the public good; are they to blame if they seek theirs, especially as their necessities are greater? We would not pretend to say that those, who hold or have held public office in our country, are in habits of dishonesty; but we know that in all governments from the time of Henry the Fourth of France to the present, there have been, and are, means for public officers to accumulate to a greater or less degree according to their consciences; means too which are sanctioned by custom, and which only the most scrupulous hesitate to adopt.

But it is not this petty peculation which we have now in view, except as it leads to other immoralities. As long as office is sought for the sake of gain, the manner of obtaining it will not be regarded, nor the manner in which the duties of the office are discharged. The candidates will use their endeavors to retain their offices, by keeping those from whom they hold them, in power, and by obedience to their wishes. Every spring will be set in motion to operate upon those around them, to render them partisans of their leader, and all the devices of cunning and intrigue will be resorted to.

The statesman ought to possess a pure and disinterested love of his race, an entire freedom from selfish motives, which we believe none but a religious man can maintain in any situation, and under all circumstances. A person, who is governed by ambition or by passion, may show the greatest patriotic ardor so long as he is under the influence of excitement; and as long as he meets with the respect and observance he thinks due to

him. But if he meet with real or fancied injustice and ill treatment from his countrymen, his patriotism subsides. Such a man was Benedict Arnold. Another may appear a sincere patriot as long as his country is in danger, or as long as his zeal is kept on fire by motives for action. But as soon as the stimulus which has called it forth subsides, — as soon as his country is in the enjoyment of calm and quiet, his patriotism evaporates and selfish motives imperceptibly insinuate themselves into his mind. I repeat, then, there is none but the sincere Christian who can always be disinterested. What to him are power, wealth, or fame? The kingdom he aims at is above, and the power he covets is the government of himself.

But as long as it is the popular belief that the politician must be a man of somewhat latitudinarian views, — as long as it appears that the majority of statesmen are governed by ambition or by other interested motives, the most worthy men will cautiously avoid political life. They will be found engaged in the professions, in literature, or other useful and philanthropic pursuits.

In America, purity of political conduct ought to be found, if anywhere. "There is no hope for nations" if not for her. It is for her, especially, to abandon the crooked policy which, springing up in Italy, pervaded and disgraced the other nations of Europe for so many years, but which, we hope and trust, has now fallen into disrepute. Americans, and especially the descendants of the Puritans, ought to be the most forward in carrying purity of morals and straight forward honesty into the principles of legislation and diplomacy.

It cannot and it ought not to be concealed, that our institutions are in danger. They will probably last our generation; but whether many successive ones will see them unimpaired, is a subject of serious anticipation. We have supposed, as every other republic has done, that our government is immortal; that the causes, that produced the downfall of others, could do us no harm. But we have as yet seen only about sixty years of political existence. The republic of Rome endured between four and five hundred years. Those of Venice and Genoa several hundred years each. Athens was a republic five hundred years. Sparta from five to six hundred. Those republics fell and so may ours, unless we are watchful to avoid those dangers which threaten our institutions.

On the one hand, experience has proved that our constitu-

tion is susceptible of the utmost latitude of interpretation; and who are to be its interpreters, its guardians? On the other hand, we have been so often told that we are a free people—so often flattered upon our liberty, that we have begun to think that all legal restraint is a violation of the rights of man.

It behoves all who have influence; it behoves our Fourth of July Orators most particularly, who have yearly sounded the praises of liberty, to teach us what liberty really is, and how it is distinguished from license:—to teach us that the inviolability of our institutions, and the stability and firmness of our laws, are the only secure foundations of liberty.

We have already spoken of the evils of party spirit. We believe them to be much greater than is generally supposed, since it leads men to view with jealous eyes whatever measures originate with their adversaries, and to adopt readily the views of their own leaders, without regard to the intrinsic excellency or soundness of either. It gives the leader of a party unbounded power, and our free citizens shut their eyes and follow wherever he leads, all the while rejoicing in their own independence. All man-worship is dangerous to the liberty of a republic. We ought to be constantly watchful, to guard against the tendency of our own feelings, which incline us to give too much credit to our political friends, and to believe, too readily, what is told us to the disadvantage of our opponents.

There is one plan which we believe to be truly republican, and which is certainly the truly Christian course,—which we earnestly wish to see adopted. This is, that, as soon as a great political question, such as the choice of our first magistrate, is settled, hostilities should cease, and those who have been defeated, should lend their earnest and energetic support to their rulers. Thus, the truly honest men of the party, may aid with much greater effect in the promotion of every useful measure, and in the opposition to those they deem destructive. This would be true policy, and by allowing ill feelings to subside, it would facilitate the adoption of measures dictated by true wisdom, and by regard for the welfare of the whole country.

In England, it has always been the custom for the disappointed party to form an opposition to those in power; hence it is regarded here as a matter of course. But in England it is a matter of little consequence. Their institutions are confirmed and sanctioned by time, and by a respect and veneration of ancient customs and usages, which have no existence here.

Hence, no important change could be effected suddenly in England, without producing a convulsion that would overturn the government. Whatever changes are made there, must be small and gradual. Here, the case is different. Changes, the most important, may be made,—statutes, institutions, customs overturned by a well organized party during their ascendancy, before the nation are aware of the importance of the changes. A chief magistrate at the head of a powerful party is absolute, since he has the power to interpret the Constitution as he pleases. It is said, indeed, that public opinion can never be ultimately wrong, and hence the will of the majority must in the end be right. There would be more force in this, if public opinion was always the aggregate of the free and unprejudiced opinion of every citizen: if we could be sure of always getting at the opinion of the majority, and that every one understood clearly the opinion he adopted. But this, as we have before said, is not the case. Owing to the lukewarmness of some, the prejudices of others, and the ignorance of others, the opinions which are expressed by the result of elections are often very different from what they would be if every one gave his vote, and understood the question upon which he voted. As it is, revolution and innovation being the order of the age, our country may be brought to the verge of ruin by schemes, the utility of which have never been proved; and though public opinion is thus enlightened by experience, the knowledge is too dearly purchased. One of the greatest dangers to all, but more especially to republican institutions, is from a discontent with existing things. The love of improvement,—the wish for something better, is inherent in our nature. We know the evils of existing institutions; but we do not know the evils of those which are untried; nor can the wisest legislators foresee them. Time only can bring to light what is good, and what is bad. If new notions are hastily adopted, they must in their turn give place to others, or to the former order of things; but these changes can seldom be made with impunity. On the other hand, if these new notions are not immediately acted upon, time will often show their ruinous tendency, or they will pass into oblivion, and public opinion will be enlightened without the cost of experience.

Upon this account, it is the duty of those public men who wish well to their country, to guard watchfully against the introduction of pernicious measures, no matter with whom they origi-

nate; and also to lend their support to such as they are satisfied are for the public good, with equal indifference as to their origin.

Connected with the subject of party spirit is that of local interests. It is deeply to be deplored that such interests should have assumed the importance which they have done. It is the duty of the honest legislator to withhold his sanction from any measures that will injure a portion of the country, however much it may contribute to the interest of his constituents, for the ultimate effect must be bad even to them, sanctioning the selfish views of others, and leading to disunion.

It is then the duty of the Christian Citizen to exercise his elective franchise upon all occasions where he has had opportunity to form his judgment; and if his talents and circumstances render him, in the opinion of his fellow citizens, a suitable person for public office, he has no right to hold back upon private motives. The man who does not wish for office—who has no wish but to do his duty, is the very man that is wanted. As far as can be done also, without noisy discussion, or giving rise to bad feelings, it may be the citizen's duty to give the reason for his conduct—to endeavor to convince those within his influence, that what he believes to be right is right. But he will cautiously avoid the turbulence and declamation of the demagogue.

If our citizens would all pursue the simple course we have laid down,—if every man would examine for himself, and coolly and dispassionately form his own opinion—or if he have not time, ability, or inclination so to do,—if he would simply avoid acting, a great many evils would be avoided. For although it is the positive duty of every man to vote, yet, we repeat it, he had better neglect this duty than perform it badly—that is, without knowing what he is doing, blindly following his party. How many men are there who act independently? How many men are there who think for themselves? Of those who believe they do so, how many are warped in their judgment by party prejudices, seeing with others' eyes?

Unfortunately, men always have been, and always will be led. The most active and bustling take the van, and carry hundreds and thousands with them, by an appeal, not to their reason, but to their passions. To a cool, disinterested observer it must be very amusing to listen to an orator at a caucus or town meeting: to observe how he works himself up into a high

fever of patriotism, to hear his overstrained expressions, his ardent professions, and then to turn to the audience, who are boiling over with a zeal which induces them to swallow and applaud everything, without a disposition to ask whether there is sense or truth in what they hear. There are no other themes so exciting as religion and politics; and having once taken our side in either, whether guided by chance or judgment, we are most of us easily carried away by an appeal to our prejudices. We believe that all that comes from our own side is true, just, and judicious, all that comes from our opponents, is false, unjust, unsound.

The free political institutions of our country depend for their duration upon the religious character of the people. I may say the existence of the country itself depends upon it. The Grecian, Roman, Venetian, and Genoese republics, besides being concentrated, and occupying a small extent of territory, were kept together by powerful passions, such as national pride and love of military glory, and at the same time restrained by severe and bloody laws. The Americans are perhaps the first people who can with truth be said to govern themselves. Our laws are mild, and depend, as well as our political institutions, upon public opinion for their support and enforcement. Unless, therefore, public opinion is guided by religious principle, our government can have no firm foundation. Our Union comprises such an extent of territory, and such diversities of interest, that nothing can keep it long entire but the disinterested philanthropy which religion inculcates.

It is in vain for a skeptic to say that a people may be moral without being religious. All the ideas of morality of our day are derived from the Christian religion. We have heard it said that the philosopher Hume, and in our own day Robert Owen and Frances Wright, were actuated by truly philanthropic and benevolent motives. This may be the case, but it was Christianity that first produced the enlightened state of public feeling in which all their ideas of morality originated. Morality is Christianity exemplified in action. The skeptic then wishes to remove the cause, and retain the effect; he wishes people to continue to act right, while he withdraws the motive for right action, much in the manner of the ignorant watchmaker, who should remove the spring from a watch, and expect the wheels to continue their regular motion. At the present day, those skeptics who bear the character of moral men, are men

who act, or appear to act, in accordance with religious principles, but who do not hold themselves responsible for their action to the Being who alone knows their hearts. Constitutional good temper, pride, or regard to appearances are their springs of action. These are uncertain and limited in their operation. They afford very little restraint to ambition, love of power or accumulation, or to other selfish interests. They do not promote or supply the place of the extended philanthropy and disinterestedness which the state of our country requires, and which it is the great object of Christianity—love to God and to man—to enforce.

Christianity is eminently republican, since it places all men upon the same level; but its grand effect is, that it renders every individual responsible to his Creator and his own conscience alone for his actions. In a community where religion had its full effect, all government might be dispensed with; since every one would act right with and labor to promote the public good without the restraint of law. On the other hand, in proportion as a community are free from religious restraint, they require that of law. A free government cannot long exist where the people are corrupt. Do we want an instance of a popular government not restrained by religious principle? We need look no further back than to the history of the French Republic.

Art. III. — Slavery.

It has frequently been the case in the discussion of important subjects, that, while extreme opinions on both sides have been maintained with great warmth, the truth, which indeed lay between, was neglected by both parties. Thus, it appears to us, has it been with the recent discussions upon the subject of slavery. While, on the one side, public attention has been called to slavery as an evil and a sin, and the duty of relinquishing it at once has been urged upon the Southern people, while, on the other side, the system has been advocated, as not only defensible but valuable, as identified with the rights and the interests of the Southern States, few or none have been found among the writers of the day, who have calmly viewed

it as an arrangement of human society, which, though imperfect and attended with great evils, is permitted by Providence to exist for a season, but which it is the duty of enlightened human beings to improve, so far as it may be susceptible of improvement, and, when circumstances shall permit, to abolish in a quiet and judicious manner, that other and better forms of social organization may then take its place.

To present the subject in this, which appears to us to be the correct point of view, is the design of this communication.

There is, throughout the world, a difference between the rich and the poor, the controllers and the controlled. Nor does this difference always correspond in practice with the name given it in theory. In many a log cabin of the South, the white man and his slave eat of the same coarse fare at the same coarse table. The one sleeps as comfortably as the other, the one works as hard as the other. To compare the difference between their conditions with that between the wealthier members of the Anti-Slavery Society and the white laborers in their streets, would give food for consideration. But let the difference in either case be compared with that between the Irish nobleman and his wild and starving tenantry, and it is seen to be far surpassed, while even this broad distinction would be exceeded by that which separates an Esterhazy from the thousands of his serfs.

And what, in each case, is the foundation of this difference? The right of property. "How," exclaims the Anti-Slavery reformer, "property in man!" If one is born to the gratification of every wish, and to the use of more money than he can either spend or waste, while a thousand of his neighbors are born to semi-starvation — this is the order of society, founded on the sacred rights of property; it must not be disturbed; away, ye rash levellers, who would interfere with it! But if, while one possesses the means of living in a simple and moderate manner, without manual labor, some twenty or thirty others work under his direction, and in return have abundant food and clothing, with kind treatment in health, and every attention in sickness; this is too much for modern philanthropy to bear. The idea of *right*, of *property*, as connected with such an abominable state of things, is spurned indignantly; and all the bad epithets of the English language are applied profusely to the monster who prefers feeding and clothing himself and his slaves to starving himself, and sending them forth to starve.

Turn not from our page, indignant reader! We are no friends to the slave system. We possess no slaves, and we trust, never shall, though we can imagine motives of kindness which might induce us to assume the relation of master. We are opposed to slavery, however; but we do not think it necessary to shut our eyes, or refuse our pen to truth and common sense, on whatever side of the subject they may appear to lie. In the preceeding remarks we have appeared to countenance slavery, by comparing it with those institutions which the world generally acknowledges as proper to be maintained. May not a different construction be put upon our language, by supposing that we disapprove these institutions, this vast difference between rich and poor, as involving evils kindred to those of slavery itself?

"What," it is replied, "you are an Agrarian. You would have all property at once equally divided. You would have the rich all beggared, and the poor all intoxicated with sudden wealth." Excuse us. Such is not our principle. Between the opinions, we have fancied to be ascribed to us, is our real position. We regard slavery as one in a series of imperfect arrangements, which for a time must be endured, but which enlightened men and Christians ought to be doing their best to improve, temperately, gradually, peaceably, and with good nature; arrangements too, which are yielding, with more or less rapidity, before the influence of science and of the Christian religion.

In a savage state, men are all equal. In emerging from this state, talents and industry, or less worthy causes, create differences of station. Certain possessions, which were at first common, become guarantied to individuals. One acquires by force or cunning an ascendancy over others, and becomes a master over slaves, or a chief over followers, or a king over subjects. As civilization advances, these distinctions increase, till some few, most aspiring and most successful, have reached the highest point of wealth and power. The difference between these, and the individuals at the foot of the hill, is now of course greatest. But a change now ensues. The lowest, who have not yet risen, begin to rise. The highest can rise no higher, and begin to fall, or at least remain stationary, while others approach their level. Civilization now advances with rapidity. It is no longer the civilization of the few, but of the many. Its tendency is to restore equality; and if we could

look for perfectibility in man, this would be the result. But thuogh entire equality is neither possible, nor, as man is constituted, desirable, it may appear on examination, that a much nearer approach to it may and will be made, than is generally anticipated. Wide as the distinctions are which yet exist in New England, there prevails in the Northern States more of equality, than could have been conceived of by an enlightened man of the sixteenth century, as reconcilable with the good order of society. And there was more of equality existing in England then, than would have been thought safe by the barons who extorted Magna Charta from King John. Society is improving. We cannot decide how far it shall improve, but far be it from us to mark as unalterable the limits it has now attained, to say to the human mind, and to the spirit of liberty, "Thus far shall ye go, and no farther."

It is very evident, however, that if society be thus indefinitely improvable, the process to which it should be subjected, must be a gradual one. It must keep pace with the progress of knowledge. It is thus that the most important advances have been made. It is thus that the only solid conquests have been gained. The cause of liberty has advanced in England ever since the iron days of William the Conqueror. The exceptions to this general assertion are to be found in those instances where improvement had been carried beyond the capacity of the age to bear, and where a retrograde movement necessarily followed. Thus the triumphs of the barons and people, who placed Henry the Fourth upon the throne, led to the anarchy of the "Wars of the Roses," and eventually to the despotism of the Tudors. Thus the premature revolution, which deprived Charles the First of his life, resulted in the single sway of Cromwell, and afterwards in the worse tyranny of Charles the Second. Where the progress of liberty was most gradual, there it was most sure. In the hard struggles under John and Henry the Third, the people gained little at a time, but what they gained they kept. That, which the sudden energy of the people failed to accomplish in their short-lived commonwealth, has been attained, or is in the course of attainment, in a series of deliberate and majestic movements, the revolution of 1688, — the establishment of the Hanoverian line in place of the Stuarts; the American Revolution, which had its effects in England as well as here, — and those great triumphs of the people, by which our own day has been distin-

guished. France has commenced a similar course. A sudden change from despotism to perfect freedom, was tried, and failed. The result was a retrograde movement to a despotism almost worse than the former. Then commenced a more silent, gradual, and certain progress in the establishment of the charter, in the exercise of the rights which that charter recognised, and at length, as in England, in the solemn deposition of the unworthy reigning family, and the choice of another, whose right to govern should be founded on the public interest and the public will.

With so much of the history of mankind before us, — and other illustrations might be furnished, — can we doubt the truth of the principle, that improvement to be lasting, must be gradual? Can we doubt it, when we reflect on the nature of society, as made up of individuals? Though some leading minds may go centuries before their age, they are bright exceptions to human nature in general. We cannot with any certainty speculate far on the effect of institutions which we have not seen; and if we place ourselves under such institutions, since we know nothing of them from previous experience, we do not trust them; even if they operate moderately well, which is scarce to be expected, their faults attract more notice than their excellencies, and we desire to go back to the good old way, as we fancy it, with the conveniences as well as the evils of which we are familiar. Thus it is with the majority of men. The experiment of a thorough and immediate revolution is too great for them. They could see one new wheel at a time put into the social machine, and watch its operation with interest and with calmness; but when the whole fabric is torn in pieces, and new and unknown powers are introduced in its place, they are dazzled, bewildered, rendered incapable of calm judgment, and if the new machine for a moment works wrong, they hasten in terror, to rear again the fragments of that which has been destroyed, preferring it, with all its faults, to that which has occupied its place.

In the American Revolution, the fabric of social order in this country received very little change. The institutions of the respective States experienced scarce any alteration, and the general government, being constituted on the well known model of the provincial assemblies, appeared from the very moment of its establishment a familiar thing. In the French Revolution all was different. The nation knew nothing of directories or as-

semblies, understood them not, and had no confidence in them. One thing they did understand. That was despotism, and they went back to that as soon as possible.

The social system, then, is indefinitely improvable; but its improvement must be gradual in order to be permanent. The evils that exist in the social system are to be viewed with reference to these principles. Imperfect forms of social order are to be regarded, not as absolute evils, but as relative. Limited monarchy is better than despotism; it is not so good, we believe, as republican government. A state of war is far worse than one of peace and comfort; but many think it preferable to a state of oppression; and the more so, because war is in its nature temporary, while unresisted oppression perpetuates itself. Thus too, slavery, as it exists in the United States, is a relative evil. It is far better than slavery as it has existed elsewhere; for instance, among the Romans, whose slaves might, at the will of the master, be obliged to murder or be murdered as gladiators in the circus; it is bad in comparison with the form of domestic servitude which exists in the large cities of the north. And it may be found a century hence, that *this* domestic servitude is also relatively bad. Nay, it has been so decided throughout the interior of New England, for there the "help," who takes her seat with the family at the board which she has but assisted in preparing, is a very different person from the domestic of the city.

Christianity is in harmony with nature and reason, on this as on every subject. The Savior and his Apostles touch not the subject of slavery, except in enforcing the great duties of justice and benevolence towards all, and in pointing out the relative obligations of master and slave, under the existing state of things. But these precepts, and the general spirit of Christianity, first rendered the treatment of those in bondage more lenient, and afterwards gradually abolished the system throughout southern and western Europe. Such, we trust, will be the result of Christian feelings and principles, brought to bear upon this subject, in our own land.

How then may the slave system be ameliorated, and what hope is there of its ultimate removal, to give place to a better order of society? To answer these questions intelligently, we must examine the nature and extent of the evils we wish to remedy. What then is slavery in the United States?

Among the inhabitants of our country, there exist three mil-

lions, or upwards, of a different race from the rest, and bearing the marks of distinction most obviously and indelibly. Of these, about two hundred and fifty thousand are, at least, nominally free. The great mass, however, forming the chief laboring population of the south, are under the authority of white masters, and are regarded by the laws of their respective states in a mixed character. The law extends to them protection in life and limb against their owners, as against others; but it sanctions their transfer from one to another master, by the forms of sale, gift, or bequest, and in so far regards them as property. To secure for them humane treatment, some regulations have been made by the legislatures of certain states,—as for instance, those establishing a minimum allowance of food. We have seen such a law extracted from the statute book, and held up to view, apparently to produce the impression that this *minimum* allowance was all that the slaves usually received! Generally speaking, however, the law in the Southern States interferes but little between the parties. Theirs is regarded as a domestic relation, and the servant is considered as better protected by the united interest and good feelings of his owner, than he could be by numerous laws, which must either be inoperative, or enforced through an odious system of domestic espionage.

As to the working of this system, the account, we are about to give, is derived from a long residence in the remoter Southern States. We shall present the result of our own experience and inquiries; and if they agree not in any respect with those of others, the candid reader will prefer that statement which seems most consistent with the common principles of human nature.

Our decided impression then is, that the slaves are, *generally speaking*, treated well in regard to food, discipline and attention to their outward comfort. They are not overworked; they have a sufficiency of wholesome food. The punishments inflicted on them, or rather on the indolent and disorderly *among* them, are neither of frequent occurrence, nor of extreme severity; and not being accompanied with any feeling of deep disgrace, produce no permanent suffering. In the transfer of a slave by sale, or in letting out his services by the year, the servant is frequently allowed to find a master for himself, and most owners would scruple to place a domestic under the care of one to whom the individual expressed a decided objection.

It is the impression at the South alike among all classes, that persons from the North are less kind as owners, than those

brought up from childhood among the Southern community. If it be so, the fact can readily be explained, without supposing any difference in natural good feeling between the citizens of these two sections. It is certain that there exists at the South very little of that personal prejudice against the colored race, which in New England is terror in the child, and loathing in the adult.

We have spoken of the general good treatment of the slaves, would that we could assert it to be without exception. But where the control of the master is so unlimited, it is evident that abuse of power is possible, and from what scripture and reason teach us of human nature, instead of wondering that power is sometimes exercised amiss among slave-owners, there is cause, great cause, why we should wonder that this abuse is not far more common.

That it is *possible*, is one chief evil of the system. Nor is it of much avail to say in its defence, that, though no law can reach the offenders, they are punished by public opinion. Public opinion is too often swayed in its judgment, or at least prevented from expressing itself effectually, by the wealth or station of the offender; and there are many in every community, who are thoroughly hardened against its influence.

In speaking of the abuses which the slave system permits, we refer not chiefly to such atrocious instances as brave the vengeance of the law. We have in view rather the permission, the possibility of harsh treatment, not affecting the life, but very materially interfering with the happiness of the individual. Such is certainly sometimes to be met with, and though the community around may be acquainted with the facts, and indignant at them, yet the case must be extreme which would be thought to justify interference. It is true that instances of cruelty are occasionally heard of in the Northern States, on the part of masters towards apprentices, and teachers towards pupils; but the apprentice or the pupil has a protector in his parent or guardian. The master himself is at the South regarded as the protector of his slave. If he abuse his trust, the task of restraining him is too much divided among those around, for any one to feel much responsibleness in the matter.

But there may be a worse abuse than that of cruelty. It is a horrible thought, that throughout a large portion of our country, a crime, which elsewhere would bring its perpetrator to the gallows, is virtually legalized, by the absence of any efficient

restraint upon the will of the master. We believe the crime referred to is of exceedingly rare occurrence, — but it is so, because rendered superfluous by the moral degradation of the slaves:

"For seldom monarchs sigh in vain."

The separation of families at the will of their owners is an evil of no uncommon occurrence in the Southern States. And it is an evil which, in our view, would probably before long, be corrected, but for the misdirected, though well-meant, efforts of the immediate abolitionists. This evil is not a necessary part of the slave system, any more than the absolute control of the Roman master over the life of his bondsman. That odious feature has been removed by Christianity; and in our opinion, the principles of Christianity exist in the South in sufficient strength to remove the other evil, if appealed to in a proper manner. But the abolitionists have attempted too much. They strive to change the fundamental institutions of society in the South at once. The Southern people knowing that this is impossible, and if possible, would be ruinous, place themselves in the attitude of conservatism. They will not give up one point, because they are summoned in no gentle terms to give up all. But let the evil, the horrible evil of this one practice be even yet presented before them in a fitting manner, and we have faith enough in human nature to believe that it will not long be permitted, either by the laws, or the moral sense of the Southern community.

The evil we refer to is, — not that a youth of sufficient age to dispense with the immediate care of his parents, may be separated from them, — for this might be the case, whether he were bond or free; it is not that families may be compelled to move together, to follow their masters, they know not whither; for though there may be suffering caused by this, the will of the master is not more despotic than the circumstances which often compel families in higher stations to emigrate to some distant part of the land; — but it is that man interferes to put asunder those whom God has joined together, the husband and the wife, — and that in so doing he violates the law of nature, and that of Christianity. It is in vain to reply to this that no valid marriage can exist between slaves. The laws of the white man do not recognise any such marriage indeed, that is, they give no sanction, no protection to the tie, — and this is the very

root of the evil. But no law, as far as we have understood, has gone so directly counter to scripture and common sense, as to declare that the connexion of a colored man and woman, recognised by the parties in presence of a clergyman, with the usual forms, has any thing criminal in it. The law has let this subject entirely alone. It has only failed to give its sanction to the law of nature and of the Bible. But who can doubt that those who sanctify their permitted union in the best manner they are allowed, are, in the sight of God joined in marriage! What minister of the Gospel ever refused to sanction such a marriage by his performance of the ceremony! Conceive the master present on such an occasion. He hears the parties pronounced to be man and wife. He hears the words, "whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." His own consent has been previously asked and obtained. His own presence has sanctioned the contract. A week, or a year, or two years afterwards, he sees occasion to sell the husband to a trader who is going to Texas. Is the master innocent? The law of man does not condemn him. But what says the law of God?

It is no sufficient answer to say, that the negroes themselves do not consider these contracts permanently binding. In the first place, the assertion is not universally, nay not even generally true. There are many pious and intelligent slaves, who would as deeply feel the the sin of a voluntarily separation from their chosen partners, as the most conscientious of their superiors. In the second place, this idea among the negroes, of which more hereafter, results solely from their perceiving how lightly their marriage ties are estimated by their owners; and the owners cannot plead one of the melancholy effects of their own wrong as an excuse for it. In the third place, the question is not what the slaves think of their marriages, but what God thinks of them. The law of marriage, given in nature and the Bible, is no more in the power of the slave to alter, than of his owner.

As to the miserable subterfuges, that husbands and wives among the slaves do not treat each other kindly, — do not feel their separation, — are often happier apart, — they are not worth answering. What have pretences like these to do with a plain question of Christian duty?

"But the slaves will form new connexions in their new homes." And what name does the Scripture give to such new connexions? Adultery. And who is chiefly responsible for

this crime; the ignorant slave who commits it, or his master, who has exposed him to the almost irresistible temptation? It may be said that the removal has effected a divorce. To us, this appears to contradict the language of our Savior; — but admitting its truth, though it may exculpate the slave, does it not transfer the whole weight of accountableness to the master?

We know that there are many among our brethren of the South, who feel as we do on the subject of this great abuse of power. We know there are still more, — we trust a large majority of the slave-holding population, who would have no part in the crime of separating husband and wife. But this is not enough. The thing is yet done, done publicly, and without remedy in law. It ought to be remedied in a country where the Gospel is received as the rule of life. It can be remedied without affecting the other parts of the slave system. All that is necessary is, to legalize the marriages of slaves. Let a license be given in writing by the master, or masters. Let the marriage be solemnized by a clergyman, a magistrate, or any neighboring planter, whose duty it shall be to preserve this license with his own return upon it. Then let the law provide such penal sanctions as may be thought fit, for the security of the rights which it has thus recognised. Is it said that this would be admitting that the slave is something more than property? It is too late to object against such an admission. The question upon which abolitionists and slaveholders have wasted much time, and exhibited much mutual passion, is settled by those laws which guarantee the safety of the slave in life and limb. If his life be secured by law, why not his domestic relations? If you guarantee to him, by penal enactment, a certain quantity of food, why may you not secure to him the enjoyment of a union, formed with his master's consent, and sanctioned by the laws of God and nature?

Another evil, to which we must advert, is the intellectual and moral degradation of the colored race. Though perpetuated and increased by the slave system, this degradation includes the nominally free colored people, at least in the South. It is obvious, then, that emancipation alone would not at once remove this evil. We believe rather, that, for a time at least, it would increase it. This opinion is grounded on the notorious fact, that the free blacks in the Southern States are less moral, less worthy, generally speaking, than the slaves. We

know indeed, honorable exceptions, but few who have resided at the South, will question the general correctness of this statement. And it is perfectly natural that a class unfitted for liberty, no longer feeling the restraint of an owner's authority, yet not admitted to that rank where they would feel the restraint of an enlightened public opinion, should exhibit more looseness of conduct than in their former state of bondage. But the elements of this degradation should be examined more in detail.

1. *Ignorance.* It is known that the laws of most Southern States prohibit the instruction of the slave in reading and writing. This restriction is considered necessary, to prevent the acquisition of that power, which would result from a knowledge of their own strength, and of that wish for liberty, which increases with increasing intelligence. It is considered, by those who impose it, a restriction not less required by the true interests of the colored people, than by that of the whites. We are not prepared either to admit or deny the propriety of this view, if the slave system be regarded as permanent in its character; but if that system is destined gradually to pass away, few will question that the instruction of the future freedmen should at once receive attention.

2. *Mental Imbecility.* Highly as all intelligent minds must appreciate the knowledge communicated by books, the education, which gives such knowledge, is not the *most* valuable. A man, who has never learned to read and write, may yet be happy, virtuous, useful, and in his station respectable. A more valuable education than in reading and writing is that which consists in the development of their own powers. Let the individual feel that he is a man, — that he has a station to fill, for the discharge of whose duties he is responsible not only to his fellow-mortals, but to his own conscience. We leave out of view for the present, the idea of religion; but he who does not feel this self-reference, who works merely because another's eye is on him, and has no consciousness of a character to acquire or to support, is a child, however many years he may have lived; — he is a creature of momentary impulse, and that only of an inferior kind; he is unsuited to take care of himself. The manliness of character which he needs, is usually acquired by free persons through an intercourse with the cares and requirements of life. There is another way in which it may be gained, — through the influence of religion. The feeling of re-

sponsibleness to a higher power more than neutralizes the degrading effect of subjection to a fellow-mortal, and the slave, who discharges his daily task faithfully though no eye be upon him, because it is the duty of the station in which God has placed him, is a MAN, spite of his condition, in all the dignity of human nature. Such an individual is prepared for freedom. He might need, it is true, on being emancipated, some practical directions as to the course he should pursue in a mode of life, in which he has thus far had no experience; but he is already furnished with the principles which, in any situation, will guide him safely in the end. The individual then is the better prepared for freedom, the more faithfully, contentedly, and in a religious spirit, he discharges the duties of the slave. And on the other hand, it will readily be admitted, that the more of the spirit of the intelligent freeman he brings to his labor, the more he works as a *man*, and the less as a *machine*, the more valuable he will be to his master. The unavoidable conclusion is, that the practical and religious education of the slave ought to be substantially the same, whether he is intended to be ultimately emancipated, or whether the system of bondage is to be perpetual. In either case he should alike be taught to look beyond the authority of his master to that of Providence, by which his lot in life has been cast, to listen to the voice of conscience and obey its dictates. He should be taught, as a man, to respect himself, and, as a religious being, to reverence his God. Let the planter encourage this development of character in his dependant, especially if he looks forward to the time, when that dependant will become a free man. Let him in this case, be gradually entrusted with a responsibleness, part of that which he must in future bear. Let the comfort of his aged parents and young children, depend in some degree on his industry. Any change indeed must be made with caution, and the kindness of the master must ward off any serious ill consequences which might arise from the slave's neglect of his new duties; but as far as possible let the domestic relations be restored to that condition of mutual dependence which God appointed; let the man feel that he is working, not only for his master, but for his own family.

3. But the *moral degradation* of the colored race is a sadder theme than their intellectual debasement. The prominent vices of slaves are theft, meanness, deception, treachery, and licentiousness. We shall speak only of the most important

of these, the last. The utter disregard with which the law treats the marriage of slaves has produced the effect which was to be expected. No uniformity exists among them as to the mode of instituting that relation. Sometimes the white clergyman is called on for that purpose, sometimes a colored preacher or class-leader officiates, and often the parties give themselves to each other without any ceremony at all, but without any consciousness of wrong. Of course the views, which the slaves take of their connexion, differ much according to their degrees of intellectual and religious light. Some, we trust the majority, reverence the tie, as one that is to endure through life. Others regard it as merely a contract entered into for such time as may be agreeable to both parties. Christian planters have found it difficult to convince their slaves that there was anything wrong in their custom of divorcing and marrying again at pleasure. How can it indeed be otherwise, while their marriages are treated with utter contempt by the law of the land! How can the law of God be revered among them, when they know that their masters have the power to set it aside at pleasure? Of course the slaves, who take this low view of marriage, are not likely, even while their temporary contracts continue, to set a very high value on mutual fidelity; and the result is frequently what would be denounced in a more enlightened community as highly criminal, but what among them seems to be practised with but little consciousness of sin. We judge them not, either to acquit or condemn; but if ignorance, and the want of a legal sanction to marriage be to any degree their excuse, does not the responsibleness for their conduct devolve to the same extent on those who have the power to instruct them, to secure them in their domestic rights, and to reprove and punish them for unfaithfulness?

We have said that moral degradation, though perpetuated and increased by the slave system, extends beyond the limits of those actually in bondage. There exists in the Southern cities, a class larger or smaller, of free blacks and mulattoes. We will spare our readers the painful detail of the state of morals too often prevalent among these; but in view of such facts as are known to exist, the prudish cant about "amalgamation" becomes ridiculous indeed; and scarce less ridiculous is the denunciation, in which the abolitionists indulge, against the Colonization Society, which offers to rescue the young colored female from imminent danger of moral ruin.

We believe that a powerful influence would be exerted collaterally upon this class,—the free blacks,—by the sanction of law being given to the marriage relation among the slaves. They are portions of the same community. They mix freely together; they are connected with each other in all the relations of life. Whatever then would give more of virtuous pride to the female slave, would indirectly affect in the same manner the free woman of color; and the masters of the South, in securing by law the domestic rights of their servants, might find a blessing in return, in the improved character of that class which now presents the means of criminal indulgence to their sons.

We have thus given our views of the true character and evils of slavery, not denouncing any, but prepared, should such be our lot, to be denounced by both the great parties between which we occupy the middle position. How are these evils to be remedied?

Not by immediate emancipation. That would at least double every ill under which the slave suffers. As to his physical treatment, the discipline exercised over him is in general mild, because the *name* of slave, the habit of submission in that character, the long admitted exercise of power by the master, retain him in the fulfilment of his duty. If these be removed suddenly, how shall the ignorant crowd of freed-men be governed? By the whipping-post, the bayonet, and the gallows! No system of police, which could be now devised and put in immediate operation, would be equally energetic, yet equally lenient with that exercise at present. No. When emancipation takes place, let the name of slave, and the magistracy of the proprietor, be the last vestiges of the system to be abolished. And as to the moral interests of the colored people, is it thought these will be advanced by depriving them of the moral restraint to which they are now subject, before they are fitted to appreciate any other?

The evils of slavery cannot be cured by Colonization, unless means can be found to transport to Africa tens of thousands every year, and sustain them there, to reimburse the southern planters for their loss, and transport *them* also to other sections of the country, since the Southern States would of course be ruined by the entire and sudden removal of their laboring population. The thing is impossible. Great injustice has been done to the Colonization Society, by the ideas of some

among its most sanguine members having been mistaken for the objects which the society as a body has always consistently proposed to itself. Those objects are noble, and nobly have they been pursued. To afford a home for such of our free colored people as desire to be free in deed as well as in name, — to interpose a barrier to the slave trade, — to prepare a place to which, in the event of a general emancipation, thousands of the more restless and energetic, whose presence might be dangerous here, will voluntarily emigrate, to commence the civilization of Africa, — and to show the world what the color ed race can do under favorable circumstances, — these are objects, sufficient to occupy all the exertions of the society, and worthy of more liberal patronage than they have received.

The evils of slavery must then be remedied, if at all, gradually; by the amelioration of the system, — by voluntary emancipation, — and, above all, by the influence of the Gospel on the hearts both of masters and slaves.

Amelioration. One subject especially has been pointed out, with regard to which this is practicable, and in which a change is demanded at the hands of the southern people by the laws of nature and of God, by humanity, justice, their own best interests and those of their children. We mean the conferring a legal recognition and an efficient penal sanction upon the marriages of the slaves. Let it be no longer possible for any one to separate those whom God has joined together, and pass unpunished for the offence. Had not the mistaken zeal of the abolitionists aroused all the pride and all the passions of the southern people, this subject would scarce need to be more than named, in order to lead to vigorous action on their part. And even now, humble as is the voice which addresses them, and though he who utters it, — who has experienced their warm hospitality, and loves and honors them, — may be supposed to have "become their enemy, because he tells them the truth," he cannot but hope that it may find an answer in some native southern hearts, and lead this important subject to be advocated with native southern energy.

Other improvements in the slave system might perhaps be pointed out, but we will not enlarge upon them, convinced that if this one grand evil engage seriously the attention of the southern community for its removal, all else that can be done in the same cause, will in due time and order be accomplished.

Gradual and voluntary emancipation. It is the opinion of

many among the most profound in judging of the progress of events, that the slave system, right or wrong, justifiable or unjustifiable, cannot last, that it is wearing away, and must soon in some way cease to be. They reason, that the feelings of nearly the whole civilized world are against it; — that its spirit is in direct opposition to that which animates our republican institutions; that the free laborer can in general effect more than the slave; and that as the country becomes filled and the price of labor diminishes, this difference will become more and more perceptible. We believe it was the late John Randolph who foretold the time, when, instead of masters advertising their runaway slaves, slaves would advertise their absconded masters. If this result is approaching, it becomes the southern people to contemplate and prepare for it. Their existing laws against emancipation may sustain the system longer, but if emancipation comes at all, these laws will render the shock far greater to them or their descendants. When the southern people shall determine to regard slavery as something which must at length pass away, their course will be plain. On the one hand, by the repeal of all their laws against emancipation, they will permit that to be done gradually and in individual instances, which would be ruinous, if effected at once. On the other hand, by the most efficient system of police, they will guard against any disturbance, either by the newly emancipated, or by the remaining slaves. Then, too, the propriety of educating the future freed-men will be generally admitted, and schools for the blacks will be encouraged rather than restrained. When these things are done, the country will need no action of Congress, — no sale of the public lands, scarce indeed any further action by the legislatures of the respective states. Individual benevolence and individual exertion, more powerful than governments or societies, will gradually and in the best manner, accomplish the liberation of the colored race, as they long since overthrew the system of feudal slavery in Europe.

But even if the view above presented be false, — if slavery may remain for ages, and if it be thought right that it should remain, our previous argument in favor of the amelioration of the system to the greatest possible extent is unimpaired, nay, rather strengthened; for there is more need to improve a system which is to remain, than one which is to be destroyed.

And alike, whether slavery is to continue or to pass away, the duty of providing thorough, rational, and practical *relig-*

ious instruction for the colored people is incumbent upon their masters. If freedom is to be their lot, by the principles of the Gospel will they best be prepared for freedom. If they are to remain in bondage, the principles of the Gospel will make them better and more useful servants, will cheer and sustain them in their lowly lot, and keep them from repining at what they must acknowledge as the disposal of Providence, while, in either case, their eternal interests require this care at the hand of those who alone are able to bestow it. Much has already been done in this holy cause. The churches of the South have not been insensible to the claims of the slave population. But much yet remains to be done. While facilities for religious improvement are multiplied, care is to be taken, that, in the influence exerted, the warmth of pious feeling should be accompanied by correct, practical, and simple views of duty. The Christian master should feel that his responsibleness is great. It is not in his power to change by his single will the institutions of his country, but it may be his, by a judicious exertion of the influence he possesses, to aid in modifying and improving those institutions. He is forbidden, not less by the true interest of his domestics than by his own, to resign prematurely that control over them, which implies the duty of protection on his part, no less than that of obedience on theirs; but while he retains the station in which providence has placed him, let him remember its calls to exertion and to watchfulness. Human beings, with souls immortal as his own, look to him not merely to secure their outward comfort, but to furnish them the means of moral and religious advancement. The policy of his state debars them from reading for themselves the book of God. They must receive its sacred truths through him, or through those whom he may authorize to declare them. His servants look to his example as their guide; they catch insensibly his very gait, his modes of expression; — his faults then or his virtues will be copied into their characters. Happy is the Christian master who feels these things, — who, as in scenes which we have witnessed, kneels in the midst of his attached domestics, and teaches them to join him in the feeling, that, "one is their Master, even Christ." Happier still, when at length he shall feel prepared to resign that guardianship over them, which he has conscientiously exercised, and admit them to the full enjoyment of freedom — secure that they understand its duties, and will not abuse its opportunities.

ART. IV. — *Esprit de la Legislation Mosaïque.* Par J. E. CELLERIER, fils, Professeur d'Exegese, de Critique, et d'Archiologie Bibliques, dans la Faculté de Theologie de l'Academie de Geneve.

Spirit of the Mosaic Laws. By J. E. CELLERIER, the younger, Professor of Exegesis, Sacred Criticism and Antiquities, in the Faculty of Theology of the Academy at Geneva, Switzerland. In 2 vols. 8vo. Geneva and Paris. 1837. pp. 354 and 359.

THE Unitarian scholars of this country, who have watched the progress of the Reformation at Geneva in our own day, are not unfamiliar with the name of Cellerier. Cellerier the elder has long been known as an eloquent preacher and a devoted pastor; and men have looked up to him as a beautiful pattern of Christian piety and benevolence. His professional fame abroad rests chiefly upon his four volumes of printed Sermons. He is now far advanced in years, and in a fresh old age is beginning to enjoy the rich rewards of a good and useful life, in the reverence and affections of all who know him. His son, the author of the work, whose title stands at the head of this article, inherits the talents and virtues of the father. He is celebrated as one of the leading divines of the Genevan Church—as an eminent scholar and writer—and especially as Professor in the Department of Biblical Criticism in the Academy of Geneva — an institution founded by Calvin, and throughout its history boasting among its Professors a long catalogue of illustrious names. Cellerier the younger has published several volumes of critical Theology, and is therefore more extensively known abroad than Cellerier the elder.

The Celleriers and Cheneviere, successors to the chair of Calvin, stand out prominent amongst that noble band of Genevan Reformers, who have risen up in the nineteenth century to complete the Reformation begun in the sixteenth — carrying out to their legitimate results those two great principles of the Reformation—the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as a guide of life, and the unlimited right of private judgment in religion. They have been everywhere spoken against; they have been surrounded by the champions of Calvinism mourning over their defection from the faith once delivered to Calvin; the strong holds of orthodoxy in Europe have opened upon them their

batteries of denunciation and abuse. But the bold and free spirit, that once breathed through the lives of their fathers, still lived in their souls. They had been taught to defy bulls and anathemas, whether fulminated by Popes, Councils, or Churches. They felt that more light was yet to break forth from God's holy word. Truth, they believed, was progressive in its nature, and they knew of no modern Joshua empowered to bid the advancing luminary stand still. They have labored, with a Christian zeal, and none the less fearlessly for opposition and reproach, to reform the old theology — to expose its gross errors and corruptions—to disseminate more just and rational principles of sacred criticism. Through evil report and good report they have struggled to advance the cause of a more pure and liberal Christianity, that shall be in harmony with reason and nature, and commend itself to the attention of that growing class on the Continent, who are obliged to take up with the miserable alternative of open infidelity, or an acquiescence in doctrines essentially incredible. Nor have their labors and sacrifices been in vain. There is hardly a church now in the city or canton of Geneva, that is not Unitarian—not one, we believe, of the Establishment. It is true, this wonderful regeneration of the traditional faith in a spot, once the seat of Calvin's power, and the metropolis of the Reformation, was not the work of a day. It was commenced more than a century ago by the writings of some of the more learned and liberal-minded divines of Geneva. Through the whole of the eighteenth century it was silently advancing. The Catechism of Calvin, that was taught in the schools, gradually fell into disuse, and was superseded by one better suited to the improved state of religious inquiry. The Pastors of the Genevan Church preached only on those essential doctrines of the Gospel, to which all Christians could subscribe. In a true spirit of Christian love, they wished above all things for peace, and carefully kept aloof from angry controversy as long as possible. And it is not till within the last ten years, that they have been forced to depart from their former anti-controversial policy, and take up the weapons of Theological warfare in self-defence.

The late controversy, with the writings both critical and doctrinal which it has called forth, has served to make the views of Unitarians better understood and more widely known, and resulted — we have reason to believe — in much good to the cause of pure Christianity in Switzerland. Not only in Gene-

va, but through the other cantons of the Swiss Confederacy, Unitarianism has been making sure, if not rapid advance. The most recent account we have seen of the state of Theology there is in a volume of travels in Europe, by the late Dr. Fisk. He tells us in his chapter on Geneva, that an *Evangelical* Society has lately been formed in Switzerland, for the express purpose of "counteracting the almost total apostacy of the Swiss Churches, and especially of the Genevan Church, into Socinianism!"* At length then, orthodoxy, it seems, has taken the alarm, and is determined at all hazards to resist the further progress of the growing heresy. But we have no fears for the final result. This combination of the scattered *Evangelical* forces in the heart of Europe looks rather formidable, to be sure, and it may succeed in gaining a short-lived triumph here and there; it may succeed in exciting unfair and foolish prejudices against a sect of Christians everywhere unpopular; it may succeed for a while in throwing obstacles in the way of the growth and prosperity of Unitarianism. All this mischief it may do, and much more; and in the mean time we are willing to leave it to the judgment of impartial and good men, whether such proceedings breathe the spirit of Christ, or are likely to promote the influence of pure religion in the world. Still we have a strong faith in the power of enlightened reason — a strong faith in the ultimate triumph of truth and Christian love over all the follies and errors and prejudices of man. Where religious inquiry is unshackled, the truth must finally be struck out and prevail. The mind once emancipated from the thraldom of error, glories in its native freedom, and will not be enslaved again. Above all, we have an unwavering con-

* With regard to the Orthodox appropriating to themselves the title of evangelical Christians, we have nothing more to say, than that all sects have an equal right to call themselves by that name, if they choose so to do. And yet some might think it becoming in an humble-minded disciple to pause, before he insinuated that any of his fellow Christians were less evangelical than himself. Be that as it may, there is one error into which the author of the statement quoted in the text has fallen, inadvertently perhaps. We refer to his calling the improved Theology of the Swiss Churches, Socinianism. We have taken the trouble to investigate this point with some care, and we are well satisfied that they differ from Socinus and his followers on some highly important points of doctrine, and cannot therefore with propriety be called Socinian. If the book ever reaches a second edition, we trust to see this error corrected.

fidence in the learning and piety — in the zeal and eloquence of our Unitarian brethren at Geneva. We trust that the Academy there, so long celebrated for its sound scholars, will continue to send out many strong and liberal minds — many earnest and devoted hearts to recommend our views of Christian truth. We hope and pray that the time may not be far distant, when the healthful influences of the Genevan Church shall be felt throughout Europe — when they shall be publicly recognised in the reformation of the popular theology, and its better adaptation to the spiritual wants of the people.

But to return to our author. Professor Cellerier has heretofore given the public some of the results of his professional studies in his Critical Introduction to the reading of the New Testament, and another to the reading of the Old, in Discourses upon the study of the Scriptures, and some other valuable productions of less note perhaps. More recently he has been favorably known among us by his popular work on the authenticity and Divine origin of the New Testament, a translation of which has lately appeared in this city; and now again we have before us two moderate octavos containing the fruits of his researches into the institutions of Moses — the first elaborate work, we believe, on the Old Testament, which has appeared in Geneva since the commencement of the late controversy, unless we ought to except the critical introduction before spoken of. As was to be expected, the Unitarian scholars there have been chiefly occupied with the study of the New Testament, that they might be the better prepared to sustain and illustrate their peculiar views of Christian truth, and defend themselves against the assaults and misrepresentations of the orthodox. But in the progress of the controversy, they have found their adversaries appealing in support of their cherished creeds, to the authority of the Old Testament as well as the new. They have seen what a mass of loose and untenable opinions in regard to the Jewish Scriptures was afloat in the theological world, and have felt the importance of introducing more rational principles of interpretation, and diffusing more definite and satisfactory views of the connexion between Judaism and Christianity. The necessity of giving these subjects a more careful examination was obvious, not only for showing what flimsy arguments in defence of Orthodoxy were furnished by the Old Testament, but also for removing some of the most serious objections of unbelievers to Revelation itself. In

this, as in most other respects, the state of religious inquiry at Geneva, resembles our own; and theological discussions may be expected to take very nearly the same tone there, as here. Indeed it would be interesting to compare the progress of rational Christianity in the land of the Pilgrims and the land of the Reformers. It would furnish a curious chapter for the history of our Church, entitled—"The natural tendency of ultra-Calvinism to defeat its own ends"—and showing how naturally Unitarianism springs up, and how well it thrives, where the pure doctrines of Calvin are preached.

Let it not be inferred from what we have said of the Unitarian Church at Geneva, and our author's connexion with it, that his work on the Mosaic law has any sectarian cast, or is in the least a work of doctrinal Theology. On the contrary, we do not remember a sentence in the whole body of the work, from which one could infer to what sect of Christians the writer belongs. In the notes at the end, there are one or two incidental allusions to Calvinism and German Neology, which might lead us to suppose that the author had little sympathy with either. With this trifling exception, we see not why any reader should fail to be satisfied with the book — any reader, who reverences the Mosaic law as a Revelation from God, and would better comprehend its spirit and bearing upon Christianity. Perhaps some may be disposed to quarrel with it for sins of omission; it gives no countenance to typical or allegorical interpretation; it says not a word about plenary inspiration — not a word about the doctrine of the Atonement or the Trinity. In regard to this last doctrine, however, we should not be surprised if the book left upon other minds the same unfavorable impression it left upon ours. We are firmly persuaded that Moses lived and died a Unitarian — a believer in God's undivided unity; that he was sent into the world to reveal the doctrine of One only God, and preserve it in its purity; that of all the human champions of this truth none ever lived more zealous and uncompromising — none ever accomplished more glorious and enduring results.

The plan and object of the work are sufficiently apparent from its title. The author does not propose to enter into a detailed examination of all the Mosaic institutions, but only to develop their spirit — to present a pretty general view of their tendencies, their character, their end, their influences immediate and remote, humanly speaking, of their philosophy. Of course,

it does not come within his plan to bring the institutions themselves before the reader any farther than is obviously necessary to reveal their spirit. Neither could this be reasonably expected within the narrow limits to which he confines himself. Accordingly, if any one looks into these volumes for a complete and learned commentary on the Mosaic legislation, he will be disappointed. This the author does not attempt. The questions, ever uppermost in his mind, and which he answers to the satisfaction of candid and serious inquirers, are such as these: What was the bearing of this law, or the effect of that? What was the end of Moses here, and what his meaning there? What was the object of his whole system of legislation? and what means did he take to accomplish his ends? As to the light, in which he considers these points, we have an intimation in the following motto on the title-page, taken from Constant's well-known work on religion — a motto, however, somewhat vague in expression: "The appearance and the duration of Jewish Theism, in an age, and among a people equally incapable of discovering and preserving it, are to my mind phenomena, which cannot be accounted for on common principles of reasoning." In a word, we may say that, in our author's view, the great end of the inspired lawgiver was — to establish and perpetuate in the world, a pure Monotheism, and prepare the way for Christianity — and this by the influence of institutions exclusively adapted to the existing circumstances of the Jewish people.

Perhaps the most characteristic feature of the work is its lucid and beautiful order — the sure mark of a logical and truth-loving mind, that clearly discerns truth and is solicitous to impress it as clearly upon other minds. All may read it with interest, for it is written in a perspicuous, and, when the occasion calls for it, in an earnest style, and is not less adapted to the unlearned reader, than to the most erudite scholar. It propounds no novel theories, it starts no bold hypotheses, in which the German schools are so fruitful, and which only excite curiosity by their ingenuity, or by their wildness, wonder. What is far better, it aims to be useful. It takes its stand on truths well established and commonly acknowledged, looks at them from original and striking points of view, presents them in new and stronger lights, and helps to establish them on firmer foundations; and is not this, in works of criticism, at least, the only kind of orignality worth having? It may be called a

production of the school of Michaelis, containing as it does substantially the same principles and same views, with his great work on the laws of Moses. Unlike that, however, it is not so much a work of law, as of historical criticism and theology. While it exhibits the fruits of sound scholarship, of far reaching thought, and a cautious criticism, it makes no pretensions to the vast learning, the profound research, or the minuteness of detail, which render the treatise of Michaelis so valuable to the theological scholar. But, if it has not all the recommendations, neither has it the glaring faults of that work; it is free from its vicious method, and unembarrassed by its learned dissertations on incidental questions, which, however curious and interesting, too often distract the reader's attention. If it is more limited in its plan, less copious in detail, less learned and complete, and therefore less acceptable to the critical student, it is at the same time more philosophical, and must, we think, be more satisfactory to one, whose chief object it is to understand better the spirit and philosophy of the Mosaic institutions. Let the immense learning, and the liberal plan of Michaelis be combined in one work with the logical method, and the philosphical spirit of Cellerier, and we should have a perfect commentary on the law of Moses. Our author candidly acknowledges his obligations to the work of Michaelis. Of all the writers who have undertaken to explain the Mosaic law, he considers him the only one, who has succeeded in rightly developing its character. For his own part he says, with his characteristic modesty, that he has no further qualifications to boast of, than a long and careful study, a deep conviction of the truth, and an ardent desire to see it embraced by others. The following extract from a chapter of introductory observations will give us a glimpse of the point of view he takes at the outset.

"The Mosaic legislation, often as it has been studied, seems to us almost always to have been misapprehended. Believers and unbelievers have come to the study of it with their preconceived views, their systems *a priori*, with their hypotheses and their errors. On the one hand, zealous for revelation, but zealous without knowledge, they have looked into the institutions of Moses for nothing but a tissue of allegories and types, or an absolute and universal legislation — the ideal of right and justice, and this, though Jesus Christ had expressly said that those institutions were intended only for one age, only for one people, that they were required by the obduracy of the Jewish heart and

the grossness of the Jewish mind. But no! this would not do; a legislation good for the Jews, adapted to their age, to their country, to their character, and their destiny — this too often has been the very last thing that religious critics have dreamed of seeking in the Mosaic documents.

"Unbelievers, on the other hand, have run into errors of a different kind. Some have found it easy enough to judge, by the standard of French manners, of laws given to some shepherds in the East three thousand four hundred years ago. They have set all their wits to work in jesting about the manners of Jacob's sons, and the high fashions of the Court at Jerusalem. Many of them have cast a disdainful glance at the Pentateuch, and then with a supercilious smile have shut the book without reading it. A few ingenious writers have dwelt upon one or two details of the law with praise or censure, but without attempting to bring the whole into harmony by a general view. Others — carried away by passion or prejudice, deceived by superficial appearances or by mere words — could see nothing but a system of priestly imposture in a law, which restrained and counteracted the pretensions of the priesthood. Yes! will the reader believe me? There are those, who, in their zeal for liberal principles, have made Moses a professor of Atheism and founder of the Utilitarian school.

Scholars, impartial and learned scholars, have had no better success. Almost without exception they have struck upon one and the same rock. Instead of reading the Pentateuch itself with care, they have studied the Rabbis — attempting to explain Moses by those very doctors, whom Jesus Christ charged with having corrupted him."—Vol. I. pp. 1 – 3.

The author enters upon his work not only in a spirit of true philosophy, but with a deep reverence for the sacred books, which he proposes to illustrate. He feels his solemn responsibility for the manner, in which he executes his task. His pages breathe an air of humble and unaffected piety. He is not the critic to lay a rude hand on what has long been held sacred and venerable. His is an enlightened faith in the divine authority of the Hebrew lawgiver, and the truth of the record by which the law has been transmitted down to our times. To prove either of these points directly does not fall within his plan; he assumes them both; and yet there is much in the principles and views he offers, to strengthen our confidence in the Mosaic revelation. He sees no good reason for dissenting from the opinion commonly entertained, that the

Pentateuch, as it has come down to us, is substantially the work of Moses. The more he has studied the Pentateuch and the critics, who have written upon it, the more firm, he says, has grown his persuasion, that it is the production of a single mind. Doubtless, modifications were introduced into the laws during the forty years' sojourn in the desert; here and there we can point to some slight additions and some later touches; after the death of Moses, a finishing hand was put to Deuteronomy. But, for all this, the work throughout is Mosaic. The mind, which presides over the whole, is one — the same comprehensive and beneficent mind, that shines through the minutest details. He can discover in the law no traces of two legislations, of two epochs, and two authors. To his eye it bears the decided impress of unity, authenticity, originality. This view, it is well known, was commonly acquiesced in by biblical critics, till within a period comparatively recent, when it has been assailed by some of the most celebrated scholars of Germany. Of this our author is not ignorant; he is aware, he says, that there are many journals, in which the common opinion is only deemed fit for ridicule — many universities, where they flatter themselves no scholar can be found to defend it. He professes to have made himself familiar with the spiritual and ingenious researches, that have created such a sensation in the theological world, and given celebrity to many learned adversaries of the authenticity of the Pentateuch. "But on such a subject" — he continues — "the spiritual and the ingenious, it seems to me, are not enough. There is a kind of *gymnastic criticism*, which dazzles the eyes and calls forth the plaudits of the multitude, and yet makes no progress in science, except by the refutations it provokes." On this point, however, he merely throws out these hints to let us know what his own opinions are, as it did not come within his purpose to examine the reasonings of those critics, who have done so much to shake the confidence of the learned in the authenticity of the Pentateuch.

He says of his work :—

"It will not be precisely an Apologetical treatise — not in form at least. I shall prove neither the authenticity of the books of Moses, nor the divine mission of the writer. I shall take them both for granted, because I believe them, and because I have presented the evidence already in other works. Still I hope my readers, if I have any, will carry away from this

book some influences conducive to faith, some results, which may strengthen their confidence in the Ancient Revelation. I love to think that they will experience what I have experienced myself. In reading the Old Testament, I have thrown aside the Rabbis and their Commentaries — adapted as they are much more to mislead, than to enlighten. I have sought for the spirit of the Pentateuch in the Pentateuch itself, and in the Pentateuch alone, and this I was unable to do without believing and admiring. I say then what I have seen, what I have felt, as I have seen and as I have felt it. I have believed, therefore have I spoken. If I am not wholly in error — if, in what I am about to offer, there is anything of consistency or harmony, anything reasonable and just — if my admiration is not without cause and my faith without motive, the reader, I hope, will share them with me. And I trust conviction will spring up in his own mind, as we contemplate together that venerable monument inscribed with the name of Moses, — and without anything being said in the question of Apologetics — he will find, I think, in the study a new motive for believing in the authenticity of the Sacred Book, as well as in the Divinity of its origin."—Vol. I. pp. 5, 6.

The Mosaic legislation may be studied under two different aspects — in the books, which contain the law, or in the books, which relate the history. The history shows us how the law was understood and applied, but not how it was originally conceived. In the lapse of time it was greatly changed and corrupted by the errors and passions of man. In the history of the chosen people from first to last, we behold mingled together two parallel trains of events, which should always be kept distinct — the action of God, who founds the nation, gives the law, modifies it as circumstances require, and vindicates its authority — and the action of men, who pervert, violate, and would soon have destroyed it, had not the hand of God interposed to restore the primitive plan. The study of the history, then, is an uncertain guide to a right understanding of the law. We must study the legislation itself in its purity, in its original sources, in the books of the law alone. This is evidently the only safe course for the critical student, and it is the course, which our author adopts. Had he pursued the opposite course, he would have written a book on the Spirit of the History of the Hebrews; but it is to the Spirit of their Legislation, not to the Spirit of their History, that his inquiries relate.

The Mosaic legislation is not an isolated fact in history. It is not to be viewed as standing by itself. It must be studied

in connexion with the circumstances, which gave it a character, or it will not be comprehended aright. There are three points in the study of it, which deserve especial consideration. It held close relations with the past, the present, and the future. With the past it was connected by the character of the people, to whom it was to be adapted, — with the present, by the nature of the country, for which it was designed, — with the future, by the people's mission and destiny, which were the basis and end of the legislation. It is important to inquire how far the character of the law was determined by either of these circumstances. Before proceeding, then, to the study of the legislation itself, our author begins with a rapid sketch, first, of the moral and intellectual characteristics of the Hebrews, and then of the peculiarities of the country, to which they were destined, — of its physical, geographical, and political condition. The following abstract of this part of his work may give the reader some idea of the point of view, from which he starts.

1. The Hebrews were a new people. They were called to receive the laws of Moses at the very moment they became a people. Before, they were nothing but a family. Here was an important aid to the legislator. Had Israel, — dull, obstinate, proud Israel, — already become an established and organized community, with ancient habits and traditions, with venerated laws and an hereditary worship, what a firm and hard mass would have presented itself to the forming hand of Moses! What a host of prejudices, errors, and superstitions would he have had to encounter! How could he then have gained a hearing, or, if he had, how could the law itself have struck its roots deep in a soil already overgrown with a foreign vegetation? No! a virgin soil and a new people were what the legislator needed most for the accomplishment of his purposes.

His task then was simplified by the recent origin of the Hebrew nation. But on this point let us beware of exaggeration. Errors and prejudices quickly grow up among gross and ignorant men. Had the Hebrews inherited no errors from their fathers, — had they imbibed none from their neighbors, their own ignorance would soon have supplied the want. But they did inherit from their ancestors many false ideas and many barbarous practices. The law includes more than one concession to ancient customs, handed down from father to son. These

had taken root among the people, and the legislator could only modify, not destroy them. We may refer for some examples to the laws relating to Divorce, the Blood-avenger, and the Levirate. On the one hand, then, Moses, acting upon a new people, could mould them to new institutions, and, what is more, to new principles, new habits, new manners. On the other hand, he will often be obliged to struggle against old ideas, and connect his institutions with the established customs of the people, of their ancestors, or of their neighbors.

"Accordingly," says Cellerier, "we must not always expect to find in the Mosaic code absolute laws, — laws, which can be separated from all the previous customs of the Hebrews. We shall find many institutions required, and hence explained by those customs. It is only by the light of the antecedent history, that we can come at any just view of the institutions themselves. Deprived of this light, we should run the risk of falling into many errors, and to our eye some parts of the fabric would remain forever in the dark. How many questions, then, are there, which we shall never be able to answer! How many problems, which we shall in vain strive to solve! How many cavils easy to be raised, and difficult to be removed, only because we must confess ourselves ignorant of the fact, the custom, or the tradition, an acquaintance with which would instantly refute them! Now when we consider all this, are we reasonable in demanding of the interpreters of Moses, rigorous and precise demonstrations, answers always satisfactory, a light never obscure? Is Homer always clear, — Homer, who wrote so long after Moses, — Homer, the object of the world's apotheosis, — is he, I repeat, always clear, and have his commentators left nothing further to be said? To judge the Pentateuch by an absolute rule, is to violate both justice and common sense.

"It is, then, equally a violation of justice and common sense, to apply the Mosaic laws in an absolute manner, by wishing to impose them upon all mankind. Let us not transform an alphabet of laws into the supreme code of Christians, — an alphabet divine, it is true, but yet prepared for semi-barbarous Hebrews." — Vol. I. pp. 14, 15.

2. The Hebrews were an oriental people. They inherited the moral and intellectual traits of the oriental character, as all their history shows. Now, what are the essential elements of that character? They are three, — a propensity to sensual pleasures, — an ardent imagination, — and a remarkable tenaci-

ty of habits. Such is the oriental character to which the legislator will be constrained to conform his laws. It will offer some facilities, and some obstacles to his work. He will find it necessary to make numerous concessions to the sensual propensities of his people, and at the same time to confine them within strong barriers. When he cannot extirpate them all at once, he will bring indirect influences to bear upon them. He will resort to moral remedies, — never, when he can avoid it, to violence and constraint. Again, he will often appeal to the excitable imagination of the Hebrews. He will make free use of figurative speech and anthropomorphitical representations of the Deity, that they may the better comprehend and retain his spiritual ideas. He will lead them by motives of gratitude, and the still mightier influence of terror; and, on the other hand, he will aim to prevent all the vicious extravagancies of fancy, by positive laws, and multiplied restraints. He will also turn to advantage the tenacious habits of his people, — in the hands of a skilful legislator one of the most powerful means of influence. He will train them to daily and familiar habits, of a nature to bind them to the law, and imprint upon them a complete character in harmony with his sublime views. His law will follow them into the retreats of private life; it will surround them in the solitude of the night, and by the fire-sides of home; it will guard and control them, as a second conscience and a second nature.

3. The Hebrews were a nomadic people. Their father, Abraham, was a wandering shepherd. His family after him were wandering shepherds; and so were their descendants down to the sojourn in the desert. Now, the course of the legislation must have been essentially affected by the previous nomadic habits of the people. What then are the general characteristics of the nomadic life, inquires our author, and proceeds to draw a highly graphic picture of a nomadic tribe, as it existed in the early ages of the world. The wandering shepherd is averse to all customs and all institutions, that indicate a settled abode, or would confine him to one spot, and accordingly is far removed from all social improvements, and all true civilization. His home is a tent. He lives wandering from place to place, in search of pasturage for his flocks, or a climate more congenial to his taste. This is his happiness and his glory. It gratifies that wild, but sweet passion for freedom and independence, which he drinks in with his mother's milk. Agriculture might lead the way to civilization, but agriculture he

abhors. To his eye, a sedentary life is slavery; manual labor, a degradation; social ties, an inglorious tyranny; a settled home, a prison. How can his free and proud soul submit to social restraints? He feels himself to be lord of the regions he traverses, of the air he breathes, of the plains where his flocks herd, of the wild schemes of his roving fancy, of the distant countries, whither to-morrow he may chance to wind his way. To bend under the yoke of agricultural life and the laws of society, he must abjure his native independence, and renounce the dignity of a freeman.

Such was the nature of the people, whom Moses was to transform into quiet husbandmen, — a work it would seem, too great for human strength. But the Hebrews could not live in the nomadic state, and accomplish their destinies. It was necessary that all their old ideas, their old tastes, their old habits should be radically changed, — from their accustomed food and clothing, to their laws and worship. The restless passion for independence was to be rooted out, and in its place substituted the tastes proper to agriculture, — the taste for property, for social improvements, for dull and uniform labors. The wild rover of the desert was to content himself with a fixed home, a limited horizon, and a monotonous life. A transformation like this would have been impossible all at once. Doubtless the aversion of this nomadic race to agriculture must have been considerably weakened by the sojourn of Abraham and Isaac in the land of Canaan, and that of their descendants in the land of Egypt. These two periods of their history must have begun and carried forward the legislator's work. Perhaps the sufferings of the desert, too, which made the Hebrews sigh after the Promised Land, predisposed them, when settled there, to become quiet and orderly husbandmen; but all this was far from sufficient to bring about the change required.

4. The Hebrews were an ignorant people. This was the natural result of their nomadic state. A nomadic are essentially a barbarous, and therefore an ignorant people. The sphere of their experience is singularly narrow. Their habits of observation are superficial and irregular. Their ideas are few and scanty. Without agriculture, without commerce, without social institutions, they have no means of intellectual culture. Now this nomadic ignorance was a serious obstacle in the way of the legislator, — especially when combined with their sensual, imaginative, obstinate character. In the absence

of cultivated and refined tastes, sensuality became more difficult to combat. There was danger lest the imagination of the people, uncontrolled, should lead them astray into the dark regions of debasing superstition, and a sanguinary idolatry; and the native disposition to cling to old habits would be likely to run into a stupid obstinacy.

Perhaps their sojourn in Egypt, helped to enlarge the sphere of their ideas, to elevate them somewhat above the ignorance of the nomadic state, and to prepare their minds for still further cultivation and progress; and yet hardly enough, it would seem, to counterbalance the ancient and settled influences of the pastoral life. As long as the Hebrews were free in Egypt, they lived by themselves, occupied with their flocks in the land of Goshen; and when in the course of events they came to be mixed up with the Egyptians, they were persecuted slaves. Neither of these two periods could have proved very favorable to their intellectual culture. Besides, among the Egyptians themselves, the mass of the people were very ignorant. Knowledge was confined to the holy place, veiled in unintelligible hieroglyphics, while the profane vulgar had to take up with gross errors and weak superstitions. The knowledge of the people at best was mere skill in the mechanical arts; and to this the Hebrews, — some of them at least, — must have been trained in slavery; and yet all such knowledge was but a poor resource for the development and education of the mind, — a poor resource for bringing shepherds of the East into a condition to be the depositories of a spiritual religion, — to comprehend abstract theism, — to worship one Infinite Spirit, in whose likeness it was a crime to make images!

5. The Hebrews were a people brought up in Egypt. There they had lived four hundred and thirty years, part of the time isolated, and part of the time as slaves; and this long sojourn there could not have been without an important influence upon a new and ignorant people. It must inevitably have given them some new prejudices; it must have accustomed them to peculiar associations of ideas; it must have left a decided impress upon their character. Of the influences of this sojourn in Egypt we can clearly point out three at least: a tendency to idolatry, — false and narrow views of worship, — and an extreme reverence for the priesthood. To the priests and the initiated, the Theology of Egypt was probably nothing more than the ancient and hallowed veil of a religious mysticism; but with

the people it led to the most degrading Fetichism. What an impression, then, must have been made upon the Hebrews, who had constantly before their eyes the mysterious festivals, and the unnumbered Divinities of Egypt! Upon that ignorant and oriental people, who already were but too easily disposed to extravagant superstitions! At the very foot of Sinai, with the second commandment yet sounding in their ears, — if they are left to themselves only forty days, you will see them demanding a visible God, and clothing him with the attributes of an Apis. Will not a multitude of miracles, rigorous punishments, and all the power of terror be necessary to root out this passion for idolatry? The Hebrews, incapable as they were of abstraction, had been accustomed in Egypt to associate together as inseparable what they had never seen separated, — the worship of the Divinity with certain customary observances in the manner of worshipping. In their minds, particular forms of the temples or of the altars, — certain emblems and ceremonies were intimately associated with all the ideas they had of God. Now, to break up this vicious association of ideas, the legislator will need much time and much skill; perhaps he will be obliged to resort to severe punishments. At all hazards, he must prevent its leading his people to Egyptian idolatry; and in the mean time, he may perhaps preserve in his own worship some of those forms, which have acquired an influence over their mind. But what a singular precedence, — what a superior wisdom will he need to shun the dangerous shoals around him!

In Egypt the sacerdotal caste enjoyed distinguished privileges. To them alone belonged all the science and the learning, covered with a thick veil, which they were careful never to remove. According to Herodotus, a third part of the lands was the property of the priests; and so far from complaining of these monopolies, the submissive people looked upon all the splendor and opulence of the priests, as a right inherent in their order. Now, the descendants of Abraham are eye-witnesses of this order of things, — themselves slaves, and trained from the beginning to the like oppression; and will not they too be ready to submit to the same yoke, if Moses is pleased to fasten it upon them? And what course will he take? He belongs to the race chosen to give priests to Israel; he may, if he chooses, be the High Priest himself; his children too may become priests. Here the prejudices of the people, — perhaps his own, — are in harmony with his interest. Still more, he may deem priestly

monopolies and privileges highly important to the stability of the state and the success of his undertaking. All his education would naturally have led him to this belief. Will he suffer himself, then, to be influenced by his interest, by his prejudices, and by the example of his masters, or will he be governed by a higher wisdom? Will he show himself the cunning contriver of a despotism, or the generous friend of human progress? A minister to the passions and selfishness of man, or the messenger of God? From the choice the legislator will make here, we may judge somewhat whether his ministry is of human or divine origin.

6. The Hebrews were a peculiar people. Nations, like individuals, have a character of their own. So the ancient Hebrews had peculiarities of character belonging to their race, or owing to some causes, of which we are ignorant. Their most striking traits of character are best illustrated by a reference to the external causes already developed. One of these traits, however, deserves to be considered by itself; for it seems too deep-rooted, too bold, too constant in its influence to be sufficienly explained by supposing it to have been the combined results of Jewish ignorance, and the oriental tenacity of habits, — it is their stupidity. This word is intended to convey the idea of their extreme slowness in grasping and admitting new ideas, and, as a natural consequence, their often strange and weak obstinacy in retaining old ones. In reading their history, we are sometimes confounded at their excessive backwardness in comprehending the will of God, — in trusting to him and his prophet, — in desiring and appreciating the blessings, which he wishes to secure to them. The most startling miracles seem to fall dead upon their souls. One would suppose that their old tastes and prejudices would have been a thousand times destroyed by the sufferings they endured in Egypt,— by theeventful scenes which accompanied their departure thence, — by all the signs and wonders which were displayed before their very eyes. But no! Their eyes are veiled, and all their senses enveloped in a thick cloud of moral darkness. This brutal dulness of itself must be a heavy obstacle for the legislator to surmount; for a people have need of intelligence in all situations, and at all periods. Through lack of it, the law with difficulty will be comprehended, — with difficulty be accepted and carried into execution.

To the several characteristics of the Hebrews, which have

been mentioned, might also be added that of an enslaved people. Indeed, it is to slaves fled from Egypt, that Moses is obliged to give his laws. But it was not for him to take advantage of this servile disposition, accommodate himself to it, or even modify it; it was necessary that it should be crushed at the outset. The conquest of Canaan, as well as the existence of every free and vigorous institution, was incompatible with the spirit of servitude. Accordingly, the degraded generation of slaves were to die in the desert, and from their ashes was to spring up a free people to receive from Moses a country and laws. The race, that crossed the Jordan in arms to claim the heritage of their fathers, were still a nomadic, oriental, ignorant, and stupid race, but they were no longer a race of slaves.

Such, then, was the character of the Hebrews; they were a new, an oriental, a nomadic, an ignorant, a stupid people, and a people brought up in Egypt. Such was the people whom Moses was to organize into a political community, and for whom he was to make laws, not one of which he could ever see carried into execution. Such was the people whom he was to establish in a new country, — a country not yet conquered, — a country, which he had never seen himself, and was destined never to enter.

After this sketch of the character of the Hebrews, our author proceeds to take a general survey of the country they are to occupy. He draws a beautiful picture of Palestine, as it must have appeared in ancient times. He speaks of the frontiers and natural boundaries of the Holy Land, — of the nature and configuration of its soil, — of its productions, temperature, and climate; and from a very general view, he deduces certain results, that would naturally influence the course of the legislation. He does not stop to dwell upon the more particular results, such as the regularity of the climate, the saline nature of the soil, the season of harvesting, the abundant supply of water, and a thousand other details of the same kind intimately connected with institutions, of which they are the basis, the reason, or the explanation. He passes by all such particulars, — though in themselves worthy of notice, — and confines himself to general results. These he divides into three classes, — the agricultural, the military, and the commercial relations of the country.

1. The agricultural relations. On this subject he comes to the following conclusions, respecting the fitness of the country for agriculture: —

"From all we have said, it may be inferred that the Holy Land was a country eminently fitted for agriculture, and demanding a population devoted to agricultural pursuits. Its fertility is a fact historically certain, notwithstanding the pleasantries of some modern unbelievers on this point. If to this day the soil of Palestine displays so much vigor, after eighteen centuries of dreadful ravages, in the hands of the Mussulmans, and under a wasting and oppressive administration, — what would it not have produced before all these causes of unfruitfulness had begun to operate, in the hands of a free and industrious people! We may judge somewhat as to the extent of the changes in the quality of the soil, which ages of war and oppression have brought about, by comparing the barrenness of two sections of Palestine at the present day, now abandoned to their native wildness, with what Josephus tells us of their admirable fertility. I refer to the left bank of the sea of Galilee, and to the plain of Jericho. What is more, we have also the direct testimony of profane authors to the same point. Tacitus compares the fertility of Palestine with that of Italy. The Greeks, it is true, complained of the sterility of parts of it, but it was simply of the country around Jerusalem, and that only as far as the cultivation of corn was concerned, and in other respects, it is highly extolled by Strabo. Abulfede says, that Palestine was the most fruitful portion of Syria. Deuteronomy assumes and often speaks in praise of this fertility. See for example, Deut. viii. 7 – 10. In short, this country was eminently fertile, — watered as it was by the mountain torrents, that poured down from the Libanus at the north, from Ephraim at the centre, and from Seir at the south. It was a smiling oasis in the heart of the sands of Syria. Enriched with every variety of soil, and, so to speak, with distinct climates, it enjoyed the peculiar good fortune of being equally adapted to all sorts of tillage. All that this Heaven-blest land wanted, to become singularly fruitful and populous was a hardy, industrious, agricultural race. It will be for the legislator of the Hebrews, then, to send such a race there." — Vol. I. pp. 59 – 61.

2. The military relations. It appears that Palestine was finely situated for the national defence. It seemed as a citadel walled in on all sides. It was guarded by deserts difficult for an army to cross. In the interior were mountains, caverns, and defiles, which offered rich resources to its defenders. If the citizens, then, were united, they had little to fear from foreign invasion; and again, by reason of the deserts with which

it was surrounded, it was unfavorably situated for offensive wars. Thus, the spirit of conquest must have been repressed. In a word, this happy land seemed to call for a brave and united people to take their stand behind its rivers and its mountains, prompt to defend, but slow to attack.

3. The commercial relations. On the Mediterranean, Palestine has an extensive line of coast and fine seaports. The prosperity of Tyre, almost on its frontier, shows clearly enough all the commercial advantages of such a position. The Red Sea, too, is near enough for the caravans of the desert to establish a line of commerce between Heziongeber and Joppa. Finally, the productions of the Holy Land will easily furnish an abundant supply of exports. Its population, if given to agriculture, will hardly be able to consume all its fruits. Besides, some of its productions, as the balm of Jericho, are peculiarly valuable, but derive their full value from commerce alone. The legislator, then, will have to choose. He may encourage foreign commerce, and promise his people that kind of prosperity, which follows in its train. But, in that case, sooner or later will Israel find by her side a jealous and formidable rival in Phœnicia, already powerful and active. Or, on the other hand, Moses may purchase the good will of the Phœnicians and the tranquillity of his people at the expense of commercial prosperity. Then, he will confine the Hebrews within the limits of their own territory, training them neither to commerce nor to navigation. Which of these two courses he will adopt, we may already anticipate, perhaps, from the character of the people and the nature of the country under its agricultural and military relations.

Having finished his inquiry into the character of the country destined for the Hebrews, our author proceeds, in the next place, to take a rapid survey of the inhabitants and the neighbors of the Promised Land, and to consider the influence they may have had upon the course of the legislation. He divides them into three classes.

1. The Canaanites, who occupied Palestine, and, in connexion with them, the Philistines and Amalekites, tribes that were to be driven out, and therefore were necessarily the enemies of the Hebrews.

2. The descendants of Abraham, who lived in the neighborhood of Palestine. These were the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Idumeans, the Midianites, and the Ishmaelites; all

tribes who were allied to the Hebrews by blood, yet, through interest or passion, might be induced to make common cause with their enemies.

3. The nations foreign to the race of Abraham. These were the Egyptians, the Phœnicians, the Arabians, the Chaldeans, the Syrians, the Mesopotamians, Medians, Assyrians, and Persians; all of them nations still more important, though for the most part more distant, and so situated, that the establishment of Israel in Palestine could not be indifferent to them, or at least so situated, that Israel could not be indifferent to their neighborhood and their dispositions.

Such are the nations, with which Israel finds herself brought into contact, and the various relations she sustains to them all must render the work of the legislator the more complicated, and at the same time the more interesting to observe. On every hand we behold enemies or rivals! Not one natural ally, not one sure friend! Will not the descendants of Jacob need supernatural aids to succeed in establishing themselves in the Holy Land? That they may take possession of it, and for nine centuries preserve themselves a distinct and independent race, three conditions would seem necessary. On the part of God, the same divine protection, which he had always granted to their fathers before them. On the part of the legislator, an extraordinary discretion, a singular foresight, a wisdom truly superhuman. On the part of the people, an unwavering fidelity in obeying to the letter whatever commands Infinite Wisdom is pleased to communicate.

So much for the character of the people, who were to receive the laws of Moses, and the nature of the country, which they were to rule. This double view is a sort of introduction to the study of the legislation itself, to which our author now proceeds. He opens with a general view of the whole subject, by setting forth briefly the foundation and the end of the law, the sources whence its meaning and spirit are to be gathered, and certain leading principles which ought to be acknowledged at the outset.

"The Mosaic legislation," he says, "is, first of all, a revelation of the glory of God. Moses makes known to the Hebrews, to an almost barbarous colony that is to say, the one only God, a God, who has no likeness to himself on earth, — an immaterial, a supreme, a perfect God. Through him is revealed the true

God, at a time when the whole human race appears to have been struggling, or, rather I should say, to have been basely grovelling, in the darkness of polytheism. This luminous manifestation of the Infinite Spirit, fifteen centuries before Jesus Christ, contemporary with the old fables of Europe and Asia, amidst the Fetichism of Egypt, on the one hand, and the debasing superstitions of Canaan, on the other, this is the great moral miracle at the dawn of the world's history; a miracle, which throws a supernatural light around the Mosaic law, and draws the attention of mankind to that point so far back in the ages, so diminutive in space, so despised by the fastidious refinement of the philosophers.

"It would seem, indeed, as if neither the historian, the philosopher, nor the religious man could remain indifferent with such a phenomenon before their eyes. How can they refrain from asking themselves, whence comes this wonderful superiority of the Mosaic religion over all others, and of the Hebrew people over all the civilized nations of antiquity, and what were the destinies thus presaged to that people; what end the legislator had in view? As to the first of these questions, here is not the place to answer it. This we have already done elsewhere, and we hope what remains of this book also will indirectly serve as an answer. As to the second question, we proceed to point out the end, for which the legislation was evidently revealed; all the sequel of the work is but the development of that end.

"What that end was, has, doubtless, been already anticipated. It seems to us written all over the institutions of the Hebrews. It is that, which harmonizes and explains them all; without which we are tossed about in inextricable darkness, and with which all becomes light. It was the will of God, of him, who destined man for salvation and Christ for the world, to establish by way of preparation a peculiar people, under such circumstances that they might receive, guard, and preserve, till the grand advent, the light of theism and the deposit of preparatory revelations. Here was the great end of the Mosaic revelation, and surely it was one in harmony with the ways of him, who, in grace as in nature, is faithful to a law chosen by his wisdom, and proclaimed aloud by all his works, — that law by which he wills and brings to pass no change, that is not prepared; no result, in which man and time have not their part to do; no miracle, I had almost said, to which the operation of second causes and his ordinary providence are not called to contribute. Now, we behold him inciting man to progress, and now leading him on by his own right hand, ever making the education of the race progressive, while he is silently preparing for them glorious

and immortal destinies; ever long-suffering, because everlasting. Such is our God, as he constantly manifests himself." — Vol. I. pp. 79 – 82.

As for the sources of the legislation, it is in the Pentateuch alone that they are to be sought, for that alone contains the original and complete views of the legislator. The history of the Hebrews will only serve indirectly as a help in coming at the primitive plan, — so utterly changed and perverted was the law by the Hebrews disobeying the command to drive out the Canaanites, — by the establishment of the monarchy, by the despotic and oriental customs soon introduced into the royal court, by the schism between the two kingdoms, to say nothing of other causes less prominent. Sometimes, however, the history is useful in throwing light upon obscure portions of the law.

The archæology of the East, were it better known, might, as well as the Jewish history, occupy a secondary place in the sources of the legislation, many of the Mosaic laws resting upon more ancient customs adopted in part by the legislator.

No good would come from consulting the Rabbis and the Talmud, — faint and dubious lights, — when our object is only to discover how the Jews applied their law, and much more so, when we wish to understand the law itself. What a host of errors and follies would commentators have saved themselves, if they had but looked at the Pentateuch as the source of the Mosaic law, instead of substituting in its place the commandments of men, who in later times have disfigured its beauty!

Before showing what course he intends to pursue in the study of the legislation itself, the author lays down the following principles, the legitimate results of views already presented, but necessary to form a just estimate of his work. He then gives a brief outline of his plan:

"1. We are not to look for a code of laws, like our ordinary codes, flexible and applicable to many nations. The position, the character, the mission of the Jewish people, were all peculiar. We must expect, then, to find a legislation corresponding to these peculiar circumstances, — a legislation purely and exclusively Jewish.

"2. It is the aim of the legislator to transform, radically to transform, the national habits of the Hebrews. Now, how shall he succeed in this? Not by vague and general laws, — not, as legislators commonly do, by regulating outward circumstances

and the civil relations merely. He will be obliged to follow the individual into the privacies of domestic life, enter into petty details, and extend an inflexible law over the least and most hidden elements of the social and moral man. Our attention, then, must be directed particularly to this influence; this private, familiar, steady influence. And let no one be surprised at seeing us carefully weigh a thousand circumstances apparently insignificant, unworthy perhaps of a legislation all human, where they would be out of place and ridiculous, because without effect; yet here important, effective, and deserving special consideration.

"3. Let us beware, also, how we look, even into the Pentateuch, for a complete *exposé* of the legislation. In reality it will be founded, for example, on various customs handed down to the Hebrews by their fathers, and adopted by the legislator. These long-established customs he assumes as being already familiar to the Hebrews, and does little more than point out what modifications and what restrictions they need. Perhaps the very foundation of an institution will be taken for granted, though veiled in some obscurity. Hence the various chasms we shall find, which need not surprise us.

"Let us now proceed to develop the order of ideas, which appears to have directed the Mosaic legislation, and with regard to which we are about to examine it.

"I. The divine legislator, at the outset, prepares the people for the legislation they are to receive.

"II. In order to act upon the people with a constant and energetic power, he makes choice of a peculiar instrument, Theocracy. At the same time, he regulates and qualifies the use of it.

"III. He puts the legislation on a level with the people, by accommodating himself to their ignorance and their wants, by leaving the shortest path, when circumstances call for it, to guide the people along that, which will lead more surely to the end.

"IV. He conforms the legislation exactly to the country, which the Hebrews are to occupy, and adapts it to the mode of life, which they are to lead there.

"So much for the legislation itself and its immediate action. But all this would not be enough, for the present is not all. It is necessary to provide for the future, and anticipate the dangers, which the Hebrews would be likely to meet either from without or from within.

"Dangers from without:

"V. To guard against these, the legislator labors to keep the people enclosed within the compass of the Promised Land, and

isolated from strangers, who would infallibly corrupt or enslave them.

"VI. That he may leave them in a condition to repel the foreign enemy, he aims to secure their strength, independence, and prosperity.

"Dangers from within:

"Corruption of morals, popular disaffection, disunion, the absence of public spirit, were enemies still more to be dreaded than the Egyptians or the Amalekites.

"VII. To arrest the growth of evils like these, the legislator labors to ensure the happiness of his people —

"VIII. To keep alive in their breasts a religious spirit —

"IX. To prevent corruption of morals.

"But the Hebrew people had a mission to fulfil very different from that of nations in general. The legislator had to educate them for a special, though a distant future.

"X. With this end in view, he prepares for the people that degree of civilization and that kind of social advancement, which comport with their destination, while he refuses them other states of civilization, as incompatible, in their peculiar position, with the preservation of theism and of morals.

"XI. Finally, he predisposes the Hebrews to receive one day the light of Christianity, to be transmitted by them to other nations." — Vol. I. pp. 84–87.

Such are the ideas, the eleven points of view, about which all the legislation of the Hebrews is grouped, and by which it is explained, developed, and classified by Cellerier. The sequel of his work is divided into eleven sections, corresponding to these eleven points. The ideas, which here are barely thrown out, are there amplified, coupled with details, illustrated, and fully unfolded in the same beautiful order. The present article is intended to give the reader some general idea of the plan and object of the work, and the train of thought, which presides over the whole. But we must follow our author into the happy development of his views and principles, if we would catch his spirit and feel the full value of his labors. To do this, we must avail ourselves of some future occasion.

T. W.

ART. V. — *The Great Presbyterian Church Case.* Hon. Molton C. Rogers's Charge to the Jury, in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, March 26, 1839. Commonwealth at the suggestion of James Todd and others *versus* Ashbel Green and others. *

OUR readers are, we suppose, already apprized of the prominent facts in this case, and of the decision of the tribunal to which it was submitted. From the nature of the interests concerned, and the character of the parties engaged, few civil causes have excited stronger interest. To the whole Presbyterian denomination, one of the oldest and most numerous, and for many years, until its division, perhaps the most powerful of the religious sects of the country, it was of course a question of special interest. But involving, as it did, the rights and privileges of a large body of Christians, not fewer, it appears, than "five hundred and nine ministers and near sixty thousand communicants," it could not be regarded with indifference by any, with whom religious liberty and Christian charity are objects of any value. In truth, the whole religious community felt deeply interested in this cause, and we presume we are hazarding nothing in expressing the belief, that the result, except to the party losing, has been universally satisfactory. There is a strong natural tendency to sympathize with all, whose rights of any sort are invaded; and when those rights are of a sacred nature, affecting religious condition and privilege, the same sentiment is awakened to no ordinary degree. Whatever may be the intrinsic merits of the case, the community look with an almost instinctive jealousy upon any act of ecclesiastical domination. And though by the constitution of the body exercising it, by established usage or canons, it may be proved to have included nothing in it of usurpation, nay, in all respects to have been legal, such proofs will seldom avail to remove the prejudice against all such acts themselves. One of the last things, which a free community are willing to excuse is religious — if the phrase be not a self-contradiction —

* It is proper to state, that a considerable portion of the following article was written, and had gone from the hands of the writer, before the appeal of the defendants from the verdict of the jury, and the subsequent judgment of the full bench were known.

oppression. So that the defendants, or, as they are here designated, the respondents, who had in this trial to show cause for an act, which at once cut off, from their body and all the privileges pertaining to it, so great a multitude of fellow-Christians and fellow-citizens, had to contend, at the very outset, with strong but not unreasonable prejudices. And nothing short of the clearest evidence of right, and the stern necessity of the case, would reconcile disinterested persons to a measure so serious, even though it could not be shown to be illegal. It behooves, therefore, churches and all ecclesiastical bodies to keep in mind, that the world look with no favor upon sentences of excommunication. Except where the honor of religion is undeniably concerned, and open immoralities not to be passed over are committed, the general sympathy goes invariably with the sufferer; and no alleged heresy or violation of mere conventional rules, will remove from the excommunicating power the reproach, or at least the suspicion, of tyranny.

It was, therefore, an evil day for the prevalent party of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church of 1837, when they passed the resolve, which was the occasion of this suit. Against the party, who was the object, and whom they intended for the victim of this act of excision, no charge of immorality was pretended. The clergy and the elders of that party came to the General Assembly of that year, with precisely the same authority as did the clergy and the elders of the other party. They received their commissions from churches and presbyteries, that from the period of the act of union in 1801, for a period, that is, of more than thirty-five years, had been fully recognised as a part of the Presbyterian body, to whose rights as Christians, to whose privileges as Presbyterians, and specially to representation in the Assembly, no objection had been made. Nothing, therefore, but the gravest reasons could be accepted for an apology of such an exercise of authority, supposing it lawful. And a higher wisdom, than that which actuated the majority, and a better policy, — to say nothing of the charity, — might have dissuaded from a course, which at any rate would have incurred the general disapprobation, and which the justice of the country has condemned, not as arbitrary merely, but as illegal and unconstitutional.

Into the particular history and circumstances of this case it is not our intention to enter. The trial occupied three days, and, as might readily be anticipated, involved a great mass of

evidence, and the discussion, in its progress, of many important ecclesiastical and other questions. It excited an almost unprecedented interest in Philadelphia; and multitudes, too, without the city, who could put themselves within hearing of any part of it, failed not to embrace the opportunity. From a friend, who was present, as well as from the public reports of it, we have learnt, that nothing could exceed the intense solicitude and breathless expectation, with which the charge particularly was heard. "That it was a scene, rather for the pencil than the pen to mark the various expression, according to their biases, of the countenances of the bystanders, as the Judge, in different parts of the charge, seemed to incline for one or the other of the parties."

They could not, however, have been left much or long at a loss as to the opinion of the Judge. His charge is one of the most clear and satisfactory presentations of a case, which we have ever had the satisfaction of perusing. He enters, without needless introduction, into the heart of the case; and barely adverting to the state of the Presbyterian church previous to the formation of the General Assembly in 1788, he presents a brief statement of the nature and constitution of that body; the subordinate judicatories, as church session, presbytery, and synod, from which it is composed, the mode of its organization, the form of its government, and its constitution, of which the Westminster Confession of Faith, and, as we believe, the Assembly's Catechism also, larger and smaller, form a part.

It is, however, not as an ecclesiastic, but as an incorporate body, and authorized by an act of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, to provide for the election of competent persons for the management of the temporal affairs of the church, that the judicial tribunal of the State could alone take any cognizance of this cause. The proceeding is issued in the name of the Commonwealth, at the suggestion of the plaintiffs or relators, against Ashbel Green (formerly President of Princeton College) and others, to show by what authority they claim to exercise the office of trustees of the General Assembly of the United States of America. To understand this form of the suit, it is necessary to keep in mind, that after the act of excision in 1838, passed by the defendants, who are also termed "the old party," the plaintiffs, or "the new party," whom they represent, took the matter into their own hands, chose their own moderator and clerks, and having succeeded, though

amidst tumult and confusion, in fully organizing their body, now claim to be themselves the General Assembly; consequently, that the trustees, which they elected, and not those of the "old party," are the legal trustees.

Thus much need be said of the civil or legal view of the case, simply to show by what process it was brought under the cognizance of a judicial tribunal. Its ecclesiastic or religious bearing, affecting Christian rights and liberties, is the only consideration in it, to which we attach the least importance. In this view, we shall briefly advert to the history of the matter, as it is exhibited with equal ability and fairness by the learned Judge, and then, to adopt a phrase of the fathers in announcing the plan of a discourse, we shall, "by way of improvement," draw from the issue of this trial, in other words, the verdict of the jury, a few practical reflections.

For the history of the affair, we cannot do better than to adopt the words of Judge Rogers's charge, only taking the freedom of an occasional omission or abridgment.

"At an early period (four years, that is, after the establishment of the General Assembly) the Presbyterian church at their own suggestion, formed unions with cognate churches, that is, with churches whose faith, principles, and practices, assimilated with their own, and between whom there was thought to be no essential difference in doctrine." — "On this principle a plan of union and correspondence was adopted by the Assembly in 1792, with the General Association of Connecticut, with Vermont in 1803, with that of New Hampshire in 1810, with Massachusetts in 1811," — and at earlier dates with churches of various names, "Reformed Dutch" and "Associate Reform," within the State of New York. "The delegates from each of the associated churches not only sat and deliberated with each other, but also acted and voted as members of the General Assembly, by virtue of the express terms of the union."

"In further pursuance of the settled policy of the church to extend its sphere of usefulness, in the year 1801 a plan of union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists was formed." — "This plan, which was devised by the fathers of the church to prevent alienation and to promote harmony, was observed by the General Assembly without question by them until the year 1835, a period of thirty-four years. At this period, it was resolved by the General Assembly, that they deemed it no longer desirable, that churches should be formed in their

Presbyterian connexion agreeably to the plan adopted by the Assembly, and the General Association of Connecticut in 1801. They therefore resolved, that their brethren of the General Association of Connecticut be respectfully requested to *consent*, that the said plan shall be, from and and after the next meeting of that Association, declared to be annulled. And also resolved, that the annulling of said plan shall not in any wise interfere with the existence and lawful association of churches, *which have been already formed on this plan.*"

"To this resolution no objection can be reasonably made. And if the matter had been permitted to rest here, we should not have been troubled with this controversy. It had not then occurred, that the plan of union was unconstitutional. The resolutions are predicated on the belief, that the agreement or compact was constitutional. They request, that the Asspeiation of Connecticut would *consent* to rescind it. It does not seem to have been thought, that this could be done without their consent. And, moreover, the resolution expressly saves the right of existing churches, which had been formed on that plan.

"I must be permitted to regret for the sake of peace and harmony, that this business was not suffered to rest on the basis of resolutions, which breathe a spirit of peace and good feeling. But, unfortunately, the General Assembly, in 1837, which was then under another influence, took a different view of the question."

It may well indeed be regarded as "a different view of the question;" for it led the majority of the Assembly of that year to pass a resolution, which at once "cut off from the body of the Presbyterian church four synods, twenty-eight presbyteries, five hundred and nine ministers, and near sixty thousand communicants, without citation and without trial."

And here it may not be altogether useless to some of our readers, to say a word in explanation of the Presbyterian system of government, and of the judicatories dependent and subordinate upon the General Assembly as the head. These are very clearly described in Judge Rogers's charge. But for the fullest and most satisfactory account of them, we refer to the "View of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland, in the Theological Institutes of Principal Hill, of Saint Andrew's," which is quoted with great approbation as of the highest authority by Dugald Stewart in his Memoir of Dr.

Robertson, and which, with slight modifications, will be found equally applicable to the Presbyterian church of this country.

"The General Assembly is the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian church. It represents in one body all the particular churches of this denomination of Christians;" and according to an amended form of government adopted in 1821, it now consists of an equal delegation of bishops or ministers and elders from each presbytery, in certain proportions.

The subordinate judicatories are, the church session, presbyteries, and synods.

The church session consists of the pastor or pastors and ruling elders of a particular congregation; corresponding to the minister and deacons, or trustees, in our Congregational churches, and to the rector and vestry of an Episcopal church. A presbytery is composed of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district, and in Scotland the number of parishes, which may compose a presbytery, varies with the circumstances of a district. So that in some of the populous districts, there may be found, says Principal Hill, "thirty ministers in a presbytery; while in some remote situations, as in the northern highlands, where a few parishes cover a great district, not more than four." Three or more presbyteries, represented by delegates of ministers and elders from each, compose a synod; and, lastly, the General Assembly is composed of an equal delegation of bishops or ministers from each presbytery. Synods, as such, or as a distinct judicatory, are not represented in the General Assembly; but from their acts or resolutions there is power of appeal, as from presbyteries to the Assembly, the highest court.

From this account of the organization of the Presbyterian church, it will at once appear, that it could be no trivial exercise of authority, which at once, to repeat the expression of the charge, "without citation and without trial, cut off from the body of the Presbyterian church four synods, twenty-eight presbyteries, five hundred and nine ministers, and near sixty thousand communicants."

And here the question arises, For what cause? Whence the necessity or occasion of this great excision? The answer, we suppose, may be summed up in brief, jealousy of Congregational influence, and alleged departure from orthodox faith. To explain the former it need only be said, that the Presbyterian churches of the Southern, Western, and we may add also the

Middle States, having been to a large extent supplied by ministers from New England, where Congregationalism, and not Presbyterianism, is the prevailing form of church government, a spirit of independence, which is a prominent feature of Congregationalism,* gradually grew up in the Presbyterian churches thus supplied; and became so evident in the General Assembly, that, in 1835, they resolved, as we have seen, that it was "no longer desirable that churches should be formed in their Presbyterian connexion agreeably to the plan adopted by the Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut, in 1801."

But far beyond this jealousy of Congregational liberty, or independence of foreign judicatories, must be regarded as the cause and apology, if it has any, of this measure, — the alleged departure of the plaintiffs from the orthodox faith. Not that "the new party" reject the authorized symbols of their church, — the Westminster Confession and Assembly's Catechism. Such a charge, we presume, they would absolutely deny. But it is with them as with the contending parties of the Church of England, the high and the low church, a matter of interpretation. The articles are alike subscribed by all, but variously understood. That the *actual* faith of the one party differs in some material points from that of the other, amidst common claims to sincerity and orthodoxy, will not be questioned. To attempt an exact description of these differences, or to mark the lines of separation, would be a hazardous task to one uninitiated. At present, therefore, we shall simply take for granted the existence of such a diversity; and, in looking at its sources, we

* This independence of foreign judicatories is the distinguishing feature of Congregationalism. According to its acknowledged principles, "every organized church has entire power within itself to manage the affairs of the kingdom of Christ, without a dependence on any superior power on earth." So that "a Congregational church or society is a body of Christians vested with full power to direct its own concerns; to maintain its discipline; to elect, and if necessity be, *to ordain*, or remove its own officers;" — "for if the people may *elect* officers, which is the greater, and wherein the substance of the office doth consist, they may, occasion and need so requiring, impose hands in ordination." This, however, is expressly stated to be only in cases of necessity: for Congregationalism, while it maintains independence, encourages counsel and fellowship. Therefore, says the Platform, "We judge it much conducing to the well being of churches, that neighbor churches be advised withal, and their help made use of."

cannot be far from the truth in stating that to *the tendency given to theological discussion* by the writings of Edwards the author, of Hopkins the expounder of the system called after his name, of West, Emmons, and other divines of New England, modifying and explaining (not to say explaining away) the old doctrines; to *conflicting opinions of more recent origin in relation to religious revivals*, and the measures to be adopted concerning them;* and, finally, to divisions yet later, growing out of the slavery question, is chiefly to be referred that state of things in the American Presbyterian church, which has issued in this suit.

As our purpose is only a historical statement, having neither authority nor inclination to judge in such questions, we leave our readers to their own judgment of the importance and probable result of these differences. That they are of a nature not to be composed by the verdict of a jury is very obvious; and, though the immediate effect of this verdict must be to reunite for a time the conflicting parties, in other words, to restore to their rights in the General Assembly the banished, yet like causes will hardly fail to produce like effects; and aggravated, as they now have been by legal contention, by the disappointment, on the one side, of defeat, and on the other, by the exultation of victory, it needs no prophetic wisdom to anticipate, that the union, or certainly the peace, will be of no long duration. It is seldom in the course of human affairs, that dissensions of any sort are thoroughly healed, so that no vestige whatever remains. But he must have read to little purpose the history of the church, who shall trust much to a reconciliation between ecclesiastic bodies, not voluntary, but forced by the judgment of a civil tribunal, and the causes of whose differences are unchanged.

But, independently of diversities of opinion, which have divided the clergy, there are causes of a different nature operating in the Presbyterian church among the laity, to produce dissatisfaction and disunion. This, we apprehend, is to be found in the spirit of the Presbyterian government itself, which

* See "A Narrative of the Revival of Religion in the county of Oneida, in the year 1826: Also, a brief account of the Origin and Progress of the Divisions in the First Presbyterian Church in the city of Troy, containing Strictures upon the new Doctrines broached by the Rev. C. G. Finney and N. S. S. Beman."

is essentially a spirit of dominion; apt to control rather than to persuade; and exercising itself over churches, in the disposal and removal of ministers, and over individuals by its vigilant inspection, its censures, suspensions, and still harsher discipline, it can hardly fail, with multiplying instances of authority, to procure to itself prejudice, and to alienate not a few of its own children. In Scotland, where for many generations it has been the established religion, the people are accustomed to the endurance of authority, and the spirit of their church, fostered by a monarchy, is not uncongenial with the spirit of their political institutions. They are attached, moreover, to "the kirk," by ancient and cherished associations; by its past history and that strong bond of sympathy, past suffering; and they enjoy at the same time the benefits of a ministry, which, for professional learning, fidelity, and exemplary virtue is not exceeded — would it were oftener equalled — by any church in christendom. But under our government, which admits no religious establishment, and in whose sight all sects are equal, Presbyterianism can have no power but that which it makes for itself in the hearts and minds of the people; and the exercise of mere authority is not in American churches, nor with our notions of religious liberty, the effectual way to influence. Now, we are not prepared to assert, because we are not prepared to prove, that the clergy of the American Presbyterian church have, as a body, "exercised dominion" over their flocks. But this is evident, that the spirit and tendency of that church is to domination; and where the means and opportunities are possessed, all experience and history, sacred and profane, prove that the use of them is rarely neglected. It belongs to mankind to employ all the power, which it finds lawfully given, and as much more as it can safely take. And here, as we think, is the true source of the prejudice and divisions among the Presbyterian *laity*, which their clergy have of late years encountered. Their people have found in their pastors, rulers rather than guides, and the exercise of authority where they looked for love. Hence it has come, that in the divisions of the ministers, the people have been less concerned to maintain the particular religious party within the church to which they really belonged, than to make common cause against clerical domination; of which, not without reason, they have once and again complained.

Painful evidence of this tendency to arbitrary rule is furnished

in the History of those "Revivals of Religion," technically so called, to which we have already referred, and which in their progress, more particularly through the western parts of the State of New York, some twelve or thirteen years since, under the ministries of Rev. Messrs. Beman, Finney, Aiken, and others of like spirit, threatened little less than destruction to the churches.* To the doctrines at that time maintained, and to the extravagant "revival measures" then pursued, may be traced in part the divisions which have since arisen in the Presbyterian body, and the origin in the General Assembly of the "Old and New Party." What may be the ultimate result of the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, beyond its immediate effect of restoring the plaintiffs to their rights and privileges as members of the body, we presume not to anticipate, looking only at the aspects of the case in question, and unwilling to enter into the general merits of the parties. We believe we are but echoing the public voice, when we express our satisfaction in the very able and convincing charge of the judge; and in the ready and unanimous verdict of the jury.†

That the defendants, the "Old Party," should have been equally satisfied, was not of course to be expected. Whether their application for a new trial will be successful, or whether the issue of any trial would improve their position in the view of the Christian public, must be left to conjecture. This, however, we will venture to suggest for the consideration alike of both the contending parties, — that if the clergy of the Presbyterian Church in America wish to recover the influence they have undeniably lost, it must be by keeping in mind, that the kingdom of God is not in power only, but in love; that the fruits of the spirit are in gentleness, forbearance, and long-suffering; and that in a country like ours, all whose institutions are republican, and whose ecclesiastical establishments, if such they can be called, depend on the will of the people, it is no less the wisdom and the policy, than the duty, of the

* See for a notice of these extraordinary measures, and of the divisions thence arisen in the Presbyterian Church, an article in the Christian Examiner and Theological Review, Vol. IV. 1827.

† This jury, as we learn from the Philadelphia Reports of the case, included Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists, Roman Catholics, and Quakers — but no Presbyterians.

ministers of Christ not to seek dominion over faith, but to be helpers of each other's joy.

Since the above was prepared for the press, the Defendants have appealed from the judgment at Nisi Prius, to the whole court, and have obtained, as the public are already informed, a decission for a new trial. The opinion of the Bench, as pronounced by the Chief Justice, (Judge Rogers dissenting,) was, " that the exscinding resolutions of the assembly of 1837 were constitutional; that the assembly which met in the First Presbyterian Church, was not the legitimate successor of the assembly of 1837; and that the defendants were not guilty of the usurpation with which they are charged."

Hence it results, that the commissioners from the presbyteries within the four exscinded synods, had no right to seats in the Assembly of 1838; and the New School Assembly of 1838 are declared to be not the legitimate General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

In declaring his dissent from this opinion, Judge Rogers said, ' after the patient and impartial investigation by me, at Nisi Prius and at bank, I have nothing at this time to add, except that my opinion remains unchanged on all the points ruled at the trial." " This explanation," he added, " is due to myself, and because it has become necessary (in a case, in some respects, without precedent, and presenting some extraordinary features) to prevent misapprehension and misrepresentation."

Upon a decision, thus solemnly pronounced by the highest judicial tribunal of Pennsylvania, we should not presume to speculate, even did a full knowledge of the merits of the case, which we have not, or an interest in the result, which we feel not, authorize or invite such a discussion. So far, however, as a becoming respect, (not by us to be violated,) for the authority of a judicial body, may permit, we cannot avoid remarking the contrast of the clear, simple, common-sense statement of the case, as it appears in the charge of Judge Rogers, with the arguments and inferences of the same case, as elaborately exhibited by the Chief Justice Gibson. We really supposed, we had understood the leading points of the controversy upon reading the former; and we are not conscious, — being wholly without the pale of Presbyterianism, — of any biases to confuse our

judgment in regard to the latter. But with our utmost docility, and with the largest allowance which modesty can make for want of familiarity with the refinements of a profession not our own, we are left to an absolute suspense as to the meaning of some of the sentences pronounced in the course of his opinion by the learned Chief Justice. We take the liberty of quoting a few: —

"The sentence of excision, as it has been called, was nothing else than an ordinance of dissolution." — "Now it will not be said, that if the dissolved synods had no other basis than the plan of union, they did not necessarily fall along with it, and it is not pretended that the assembly was incompetent to repeal the union prospectively. But it is contended that the repeal could not impair rights of membership, which had grown up under it. On the other hand, it is contended, that the plan of union was unconstitutional and void from the beginning, because it was not submitted to the presbyteries for their sanction; and that no right of membership could spring from it. But viewed not as a constitutional regulation, which implies permanency, but as a temporary expedient, it acquired the force of a law without the ratification of those bodies. It was evidently not intended to be permanent, and it consequently was constitutionally enacted, and constitutionally repealed by an ordinary act of legislation; and those Synods, which had their root in it, could not be expected to survive it. There never was a design to attempt an amalgamation of Ecclesiastical principles, which are as immiscible as water and oil; much less to effect a commixture of them only at particular geographical points." — "The avowed object of it was to prevent alienation, in other words, the affiliation of Presbyterians in other churches, by suffering those who were yet too few and too poor for the maintenance of a minister, temporarily to call to their assistance the members of a sect, who differed from them in principles, not of faith, but of ecclesiastical government."

"Again, to all questions put by the established organ, it is the duty of every member to respond, or to be counted with the greatest number, because he is supposed to have assented beforehand to the result of the process preëstablished to ascertain the general will; but the rule of implied assent is certainly inapplicable to a measure, which, when justifiable by extreme necessity, is essentially revolutionary, and based on no preëstablished process of ascertainment whatever."

Once more. "It would be decisive, however, that the motion as it was proposed, purported not to be a question of degradation for the disallowance of an appeal, but one of new and inde-

pendent organization. It was ostensibly, as well as actually, a measure of transcendental power, whose purpose was to treat the ordinance of the preceding assembly as a nullity, and its moderator as a non-entity." — "Other corroborative views have been suggested, but it is difficult to compress a decision of the leading points in this case into the old-fashioned limits of a judicial opinion. The preceding observations are deemed enough to show the grounds on which we hold that the Assembly, which met in the first Presbyterian church, was not the legitimate successor of the Assembly of 1837."

The following are extracts on the other side, from the charge of Judge Rogers to the Jury, from whose verdict the appeal was made.

Having stated at length the principles of the case, and the questions of fact, which were for their decision; and having quoted the judgment of Lord Mansfield, that "whenever electors are present and do not vote at all, they virtually acquiesce in the election made by those who do;" with which principle agrees one of the rules of the General Assembly itself, familiar to every member, namely, that silent members, unless excused from voting, must be considered as acquiescing with the majority; the Judge thus proceeds: —*

"This is not only the doctrine of the common law, of the written law, as you have seen, but it is also the doctrine of common sense: for without the benefit of this rule it would be almost impossible, certainly very inconvenient, to transact business in a large deliberative assembly.

"Of this rule we have very lately had a most memorable instance. † The fundamental principles of your government have been altered: a new constitution has been established by a plurality of voters. Forty thousand electors, who deposited their votes for one or other of the candidates for Governor, did not cast them at all on that most interesting and important of all questions. But notwithstanding this, the amended constitution has been proclaimed by your executive, and recognised by your legislature, and by the people as the supreme law of the land.

* The reader will at once perceive the importance of the principle here laid down. One of the main questions for the decision of the jury, in this case, was the legality or illegality of the votes, by which the plaintiffs (the new Party) elected their Moderator, and organized the assembly, which met in the First Presbyterian Church.

† Question on the amendment of the Constitution of Pennsylvania.

This, gentlemen, has been stigmatized as a technical rule of law, a fiction and intendment of law. It is sufficient for us, that it is a rule of law. We never can be wiser than the law; for if we attempt this, we endanger everything we hold dear, — our property, our liberty, our life.

"Nor, gentlemen, can we know anything of fancied equity as contradistinguished from the law. The law is the equity of the case, and it must be so considered under the most awful responsibility by this court and this jury. In my opinion it cannot be better employed than when they are vindicating the safe and salutary principles of the common law."

"If you believe that the several motions were made and reversed, that they were carried by a majority of affirmative voices, whatever may be your opinion of the relative strength of the two parties in the assembly, your verdict must be for the relators. I hold it to be a most clear proposition, that silent members acquiesce in the decision of the majority." — "This Court and you, gentlemen of the Jury, have nothing to do with fancied majorities and minorities, but with majorities legally ascertained."

"If you believe that the questions were not reversed, that they were not carried, that the members of the assembly had not an opportunity of hearing and voting upon them, your verdict should be in favor of the respondents. But if, on the other hand, you believe that they intended to organize the assembly; that the questions were severally put; that the noise, tumult, and confusion, which prevailed in the assembly, were the result of a preconcerted plan, or combination, or conspiracy between the clerks, the moderator, and the members of the old school party, to sustain the unconstitutional and void resolutions of 1837, which deprived members of seats, to which they were justly entitled, your verdict should be in favor of the relators."

"I entreat you, as you shall answer to God at the great day, that you discard from your mind all partiality, if any you have, fear, favor, or affection; that you decide this interesting case according to the evidence, and that you remember, that the law is part of your evidence."

The reversal of the verdict of the Jury, composed as has been already stated, of almost as many religious denominations as they were individuals, (Presbyterians only being excluded,) was, we believe, as unexpected by the one party, as it was earnestly sought and welcomed by the other. It will be numbered with the examples, which from time to time the history of the administration of justice furnishes of "the uncertainty of the law;" a lesson not to be despised of those

who resort to it, either to repress presumption or to forbid despair. Before the time for the appearance of this number of our journal shall have come, it will probably be known whether the leave now granted to the defendants for a new trial will be taken; and we shall see also in what position the conflicting parties will finally appear. When the numbers and influence of the party, now defeated, are considered, it needs no spirit of prophecy or unusual sagacity to anticipate some signal changes in the Presbyterian body. Whether the excision of the new party shall be absolute and perpetual, or whether the breach, which has been made, shall hereafter be healed, it is evident, that there is nothing in such contests to add to the respectability or increase the influence of any religious sect. It is always at some hazard of its spiritual, which is its only true and proper power, that any Christian denomination, as such, enforces its temporal rights by recourse to law. Unquestionably there are cases when such resort is needful, because there are injuries which can only thus be redressed, and remedies thus only to be found. But in most cases of controversy between religious parties, the rebuke of the apostle to the Corinthians of the elder times is applicable in its full strength to ours: — "Now, therefore, there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another." "Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one, that shall be able to judge between his brethren?"*

One of the clearest, as it is also one of the most solemn lessons furnished by ecclesiastical history, is of the mischiefs which in all ages of the church, from its establishment to the present, have flowed from the contests of sects, and of ministers. And when, as in the case before us, such divisions come with a struggle for power, with that spirit of domination, which belongs specially to this church, it is easy to see how pernicious must be the fruits. We speak not invidiously or uncharitably when we ascribe to Presbyterianism the spirit of domination. We are but stating what adheres to its very constitution, which is "imperium in imperio." It is Presbytery over Church-Session, Synod over Presbytery, and the General Assembly over all. To an ecclesiastical polity like this, there needs no proof, for the thing speaks for itself, that there will adhere a spirit of rule, not dormant, but pervading and active.

* 1 Cor. vi. 5 – 7.

And when it is considered also, that beyond most other churches it prescribes doctrine as well as discipline; and claims a right of judging by its received standards the faith as well as conduct of its ministers, we have no hesitation in asserting, that such a constitution is at variance with the republicanism of this country, and with the love of freedom in the people, who, accustomed to liberty in everything else, submit with an ill grace to be controlled in their religion.

The very root and origin of the present divisions in the General Assembly were, as has been seen, the impolitic admixture, by the union of 1801, of Congregationalism with its own body. Now the spirit of Congregationalism is liberty. Herein consists its peculiarity — that it maintains the absolute independence of each church over other churches, and power to govern itself. And who does not see, that the principles of the one church are incompatible with those of the other; or to adopt the expression of Judge Gibson in his charge, "immiscible as water and oil." Nor will it surprise any one, who gives to the subject a moment's reflection, that "the attempt at amalgamation" has issued, as do all such projects, whether in church or state, in jealousy and alienation.

And when to this fruitful source of division from differences in the outward discipline, or constitution, we add the diversities, not few or trivial, of religious faith, which all its creeds and catechisms, any more than the creeds and articles of the church of England, or yet of any other church, have never been able to regulate, with the conflicting opinions prevailing among its ministers and laymen, on some of the most exciting topics of the times, — the prospect of reconciliation, still less of any permanent union, seems to us very distant and improbable.

Whatever, therefore, may be the claims or the merits of the respective parties, — which it is neither within our province or inclination to judge, — and whatever may be the result of this controversy, Presbyterianism will gain nothing by the struggle. May it please Him, who from tumult can make peace, that our common Christianity, which is more excellent than either, shall not suffer through it. The community at large, who care nothing for the points that divide them, will at least see, that there is division; and they will not fail to remember who has said, "That an house divided against itself cannot stand." Presbyterianism in this country will not stand. In Scotland it is established by law. It is in accordance with the

nature of the government and other institutions of the country. It is, moreover, identified with the history, and planted in the affections and most cherished associations of the people. But here, where, as aforetime in Israel, there is no king, and every man, in matters of religion above all others, does that which is right in his own eyes, it is in vain to expect submission to ecclesiastical rule. The arm of the Church, once so potent, will not now be endured; and its thunders, if it venture to utter any, will be heard, except for the discord, with a quiet indifference. No power but spiritual power, which is the power of truth and righteousness, will in these days prevail: and a church going to law may end in a church going to ruin.

F. P.

ART. VI. — *Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature.* Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY. Vol. III. Containing Select Minor Poems, translated from the German of Goethe and Schiller, with Notes. By JOHN S. DWIGHT. Boston. 1839.

THE enterprise of Mr. Ripley from its commencement awakened our strongest interest. The first volume of his specimens of foreign literature, prepared by his own hand, increased our confidence in his success, not only from the important character of the writings which he translated, but equally from the clear analysis, the liberal criticism, the hearty hospitality with which he welcomed to our language and our country, the most distinguished philosophers of France. The style of the preliminary chapter, the richness of illustration, the lucid development of doctrines, the happy exposition of incidents and characters, were well suited to establish for the Editor a high reputation for ability and elegant scholarship, as well as learning.

The volume before us, the third of the series of Mr. Ripley, as a work of art, has higher pretensions than its predecessors. The choice efforts of Goethe and Schiller, the two chief representatives of the highest success of Germany in literature, are here repeated in our language. This is done chiefly by Mr. Dwight, who has acquitted himself admirably. He under-

stands fully the poems he would translate; he penetrates into all their meaning; he represents to himself the state of mind, the mood, the conceit, which gave birth to each little gem; and he rather reproduces, than copies. His volume, very unequal, and having inequalities even in the version of the same little work, is yet superior to any English volume of translations from the German. He proves himself to be familiar with German culture, to have a mind enriched by various study, to have felt, to have reflected; to have gained the valuable accomplishment of a good knowledge of the German, and to possess in an eminent degree, what is far more valuable and perhaps more rare, a thorough knowledge of his own language and ready skill in its use. Some of his translations have indeed been too readily written; they bear marks of haste; and haste is always imperfect. But we have seen no volume from the German in our language, which shows more love of the pursuit, or more success in the result. The general expression of opinion in his favor should excite our young friend to a still severer discipline of his powers.

The character of the writings selected by Mr. Dwight is so various, and from poets so opposite in their natural tendencies and in their lives, that directly or incidentally allusions are made to the various theories of art, and to the chief philosophical speculations, for which Germany has been famous. Goethe and Schiller are an antithesis. Schiller, though ennobled, remained in sympathies essentially plebeian; Goethe, had "the predicate" and the indifference "of an Excellency": Schiller was proudly independent, exhausting his life in strenuous, unrelenting industry, rather than receive a pension; Goethe had no scruple in accepting from a prince enough for wants which he declares were not little. Schiller had a heart which would throb, and a mind which would utter itself freely; to Goethe the affections were inanimate subjects for dissection, and he always considered before he spoke. Schiller's writings bear evidence of discipline in the sublime philosophy of Kant; Goethe had no philosophy, no creed, no principles.

A great poet is the mirror of his time; just as a great philosopher is the exponent of its general culture. It is said of Goethe that he is the representative of his age. In one sense he is so. The philosophy of Descartes had introduced the spirit of skepticism; Voltaire, beginning with skepticism, had proceeded to the work of analysis; and in the general proving

to which all things were subjected, a generation seemed resolved on considering what was to be thrown away and not what was to be preserved. The Titans went forth to destroy; and in the overthrow of ancient superstitions, of ancient forms of government and thought, the old world seemed coming to an end. At this period Goethe appeared. He came before the European mind was ready to rebuild; and after it had caused the old institutions to totter. The age had destroyed former systems; and had as yet produced no new ones. Faith in verbal inspiration was gone; and it was still rather the fashion to deny the existence of the soul, than to look for sources of truth within it. This is the character of Goethe as a writer. He is not a destructive. He came into a world of ruins; but he had not vigor to continue the warfare, nor creative power to rebuild. And thus he floated down the current passively; adhering to the past, yet knowing that it was the past; no iconoclast himself, yet knowing that the old images, before which men bowed down, were demolished. His works have no glimmering of faith; he cries hist! and lets the multitude continue to adore the idol which he knows to be broken. The infidelity of Goethe reaches to the affections and to intelligence. He writes of love; and it is, to recount its sufferings, and leave the sincere lover to shoot himself. He writes of a hero, the liberator of his country, the martyr for its independence; and confounding patriotism with libertinism, he casts aside the father of a family, whom history had extolled, to represent a reckless seducer. He writes of a scholar, outwatching the bear, becoming wise with stores of all knowledge, and makes his philosopher so dissatisfied by his acquisitions, as to sell his soul to the Devil for the opportunity of sensual enjoyment. Everywhere the pages of Goethe are stamped with evidence, that he has no faith in reason, or in the affections; in God, in man, or in woman. Will you have the type of Goethe's mind? Behold it in his conduct. In his earlier life he joined the army of Prussians, when it invaded France to restore the Bourbons. He was no Roman Catholic; he knew that legitimacy was a worn out superstition; he knew that the old noblesse of France had lost its vitality; and yet he gives his early efforts in arms to compel the worship of the public at deserted shrines and broken altars. Such was he in early manhood; such was he as a writer; such was he throughout his pilgrimage. Goethe, the legitimatist poet, — who in youth was indifferent to God, and reverential

only towards rank and the Bourbons, — Goethe, who, in his maturity, while his country was trodden under foot by foreign invaders, quietly studied Chinese or made experiments in natural philosophy, — Goethe, who wrote a fulsome marriage-song to grace the nuptials of Napoleon, — Goethe, the man of letters, who, in his age becoming an Excellency and a Duke's minister, almost alone, with but one stout ally, stood out against the freedom of the press, — Goethe is the poet, who represents the morals, the politics, the imagination, the character, of the broken-down aristocracy, that hovered in the skirts of defeated dynasties, and gathered as a body-guard round the bier of legitimacy.

Goethe is very far inferior to Voltaire, not in genius and industry only, but still more in morality. In point of morality and manliness, Voltaire was immeasurably his superior. The Frenchman had humanity; he felt for the persecuted; he had courage, and dealt vigorous blows for men who were wronged. His influence was felt in softening the asperity of codes, in asserting freedom of mind, in denouncing the severity that could hate protestantism and philosophy even to disfranchisement, exile, and the shedding of blood. But Goethe never risked a frown of a German prince for anybody. He was a prudent man, and, in the great warfare of opinion, kept quietly out of harm's way. On religious subjects, he mystified; on political subjects, he was discreetly silent, except that he adored rank; worshipping birth, like intellect, and ever ready with flattery for the ruling powers of the day.

Goethe has sometimes been the favorite, or rather the divinity, of men, who rely on the spontaneous actions of the human powers, and reverence impulse, as the voice of God. But will a just analysis sustain their preference? In one sense the writings of Goethe teach the sovereignty of impulse. The moral of Wilhelm Meister is, even according to the poet's own interpretation, simply this: — Young man, yield to your passions; intrigue with a woman and desert her; neglect the business entrusted to you; go strolling through the country in the train of a company of actors; talk about art; see all sorts of people, and exercise all your powers with reference to art, and not to such inconsiderable things as right and wrong, and you will be led to the highest elevation of human virtue. — In any other sense Goethe is not the creature of impulse. He never was carried away by a holy enthusiasm for truth or freedom.

On the contrary, Goethe was one of the most wary, calculating, circumspect people of his times. He did not speak unpleasant things in a tone louder than a whisper; he kept his thoughts to himself if his thoughts were likely to give offence in high places. In all his works, — except perhaps in some of the feeble, rambling, ill-conceived, diffusely-executed productions of his extreme age, — there is not a line, which would by possibility excite the distrust, alarm the sensitiveness, or twinge the conscience of an approved profligate aristocrat; the empress of Austria will find in every line of his poems to persons, that the poet knew the awful distance between himself and the high personages whom he flattered; and the emperor Francis could consider his politics soundly and most legitimately orthodox. A free press was to him not at all a desirable thing. He himself had already so ruled his spirit, that the words it uttered had no need to fear an imperial censor. Royalists, says Goethe, and, reader, we quote him word for word, Royalists, says our poet of impulse, whom the lovers of spontaneity adore, Royalists, says his Excellency Von Goethe, minister to the Grand Duke, "Royalists, who have the power in their hands, should not talk but act. They may march troops, and behead, and hang. That is all right. But to argue is not their proper way. I have always been a royalist. I have let others babble. I understood my course, and knew what my object was." There is spontaneity with a vengeance; famous workings of the inner light; profound reverence for "the objective"! In history, his judgments are analagous. Marathon was a name that found no interpreter in his breast. The field, on which the hopes of human freedom were redeemed, was in his view eclipsed by Waterloo. Or hear him explain the true foundation of parties. The spirit of reform, during Goethe's life, had been virtually yet beneficently active; had wrought the most salutary changes in Germany itself. But Goethe's insight is deeper. "Much is said," exclaims the "objective" Minister of State, the rival, as he himself has expressed it, of Napoleon, of Frederick II., and of Luther, "Much is said of aristocracy and democracy; but the whole affair is simply this: In youth, when we possess nothing, we are democrats; but when we have come to possess something of our own, we wish to be secure." But this is not the best of Goethe's political lucubrations. Here follows his definition of freedom. "Freedom," and, reader, we quote word for word, "Freedom consists in

knowing how to respect what is above us." And, again: "If a man has freedom enough to live in health, and work at his craft, he has enough." What an admirably humane statesman is his Excellency! And Goethe expresses his deep sympathy for Lord Byron, who had the folly to speak out all that he thought; and he expresses "pity," yes, he has the effrontery to entreat pity for Lessing, because Lessing would speak his mind, would "meddle," as his Excellency expresses it, would share the polemical character of his times; would insist on taking occasion to "vent his pique against priests and against princes." And Goethe sums up the whole mystery of political wisdom in the following maxims: "The art of governing requires an apprenticeship; no one should meddle with it before having learned it."—"Let the shoemaker abide by his last, the peasant by his plough, and the king by his sceptre." We will add in this connexion but one passage more. Goethe condenses his system into three lines, which he puts into the mouth of Tasso:

> "Der Mensch ist nicht geboren frey zu seyn;
> Und für den Edlen, ist kein schöner Glück,
> Als einem Fürsten, den er ehrt, zu dienen."

This was written in the period of the American Revolution, and is the poet's reply to Jefferson, being, in plain English, "Man is not born to be free." Mark the meaning; man is not only not born free, but not designed by Providence "to be free."

In morals and their theory and in philosophy, Goethe is true to the character which he displayed in actual life. He has expressed his practical rule as follows:

> "Wouldst make thy life go fair and square?
> Thou must not for the Past feel care;
> Whatever thy loss, thou must not mourn;
> Must ever act as if new-born.
> What each day wants of thee, that ask;
> What each day tells thee, that make thy task;
> With pride thine own performance viewing,
> With heart to admire another's doing;
> Above all, hate no human being,
> And all the Future leave to the All-Seeing."—p. 187.

"I understood myself," says the eminent poet on another

occasion; and his ambition and its imperfect gratification are expressed in complaints, which this volume contains.

"What if all Europe has praised me? What has it done for me ever?
Nothing! I've even — how hard! — paid for my poems myself."

And claiming to have achieved the admiration of Germany, and France, and England, yes, and of the Chinese, he asks, pathetically, "Doch was fördert es mich?" &c. How does it benefit me? and adds: "No emperor ever asked after me, no king ever troubled himself about me." This epigram Mr. Dwight has rendered. The preceding one is wisely omitted. Yet to understand Goethe, the man, it must be considered. In it he sums up his prayers for all that he needs for happiness; but his inventory becomes too indecent to be rendered. Coarseness, the most open and vulgar expression of animal passion, was, it would seem, not at all offensive to his conservative admirers.

Goethe read and pretends to have been edified by Spinoza, and began an exposition of Spinoza's "so much feared, yea, abhorred speculations." Mr. Dwight quotes the passage, pp. 401 – 403, and at its close adds: "Here ends, abruptly enough, the promised exposition of Spinoza;" and very justly adds, "more than this we can seldom get out of Goethe. He leaves everything unfinished. He is forever exciting and then baffling curiosity." We have left out two words of Mr. Dwight's; and as we here wished only to quote what we are willing to adopt, we have quoted but little. That little expresses our opinion exactly. It is a dreamy, misty, twilight sort of exposition, that makes a part of the mysterious influence, which Goethe wins over minds, that are still in a state of ferment. Things seen through mists are magnified. Any object, imperfectly discerned in the glimmer of early evening, may be imagined into a tree, an animal, an apparition. So the admirers of Goethe interpret their own feelings, their own vague aspirations into his works; they put there what Goethe never dreamed of. But as Tasso was at last himself persuaded, that Jerusalem Delivered was an allegory, just so Goethe, since men would discern sublime moral tendencies in his works, at last came to believe, that Wilhelm Meister contains a philosophy of life, and that that base compound of false taste and lewdness, the Elective Affinities, illustrates beautifully the healing influences of renunciation, the avenging Nemesis that hangs over married peo-

ple who wish to get divorced, and the purity of virgin holiness.

The Elective Affinities brings us to the remark, that Goethe not only had no morals, but scarcely a knowledge of what morality consists in. The girl, whose affections are seduced, and remain seduced to the last, starves herself to death, and so is represented as a model of sanctity. From the lips of the pattern-woman of the piece, a lady, who is no novice, having buried one husband whom she never loved, and having now made up her mind to get divorced from another, the following oracle is published: "There are certain things, which destiny obstinately resolves upon. In vain do reason and virtue, duty and holiness oppose it; something must take place, which seems right to destiny, and which to us does not seem right; and so finally destiny works its way through, we may conduct ourselves as we will." So the pattern-woman yields.

It is this ignorance of morals, which gives to Goethe's works one of their peculiarities; insincerity. He is an artist, and not a man. He imitates, he reproduces, he does not create, and he does not build up.

In this want of sincerity lies also the secret of his want of popularity. Goethe is at once dissolute and illiberal. The poet knew in his old age, that he never could become popular. His chances at popularity are diminishing. Twaddle will not pass long for wisdom. The active spirit of movement and progress finds in his works little that attracts sympathy. The conservative loathes him; for there is nothing fixed and permanent and vital in his principles. To rest on him is like trusting in a gale to a dragging anchor, that has caught only in a quicksand.

In everything that relates to firmness of principle, to love of truth for truth itself, to humanity, to holiness, to love of freedom, to virtue, Goethe holds perhaps the lowest place. What man of his genius is comparable to him for baseness? Byron, Voltaire, we had almost said Shelley, soar far above him in moral worth and generous feelings.

Yet Goethe has made an epoch. In the art of writing German he has no superior. He entered on the career of letters, at a time when the German mind had not obtained mastery over its language, and as a master of German style, he was the instructer of his nation. It has been said of Dryden, that from his pages sometimes not a word can be spared. The admirer

of Goethe may turn to his prose, where a golden style, slightly tinged with mannerism, possesses clearness, richness, moderation, and melody; to his smaller poems, where often for pages together no word but the right one occurs, where each word is in its proper place; and where the little song, in its terseness, its completeness, and its felicity of expression, leaves nothing to be desired. Coarseness abounds; but again there are poems, which are of the utmost delicacy, pure in the conception and harmonious in the execution. Such, for instance, are "The Floweret Wondrous Fair," and "The Wanderer." Such is "Iphigenia," and, with slight qualifications, such is the imitation of the manner of Voss in "Hermann and Dorothea." It is easy to believe, that one, familiar only with these works of Goethe, should form an imperfect idea of the character of the man and of his writings.

In the next place, Goethe had great power of receiving impressions, and he turned his eye in the most various directions. The Kantian philosophy, like that of Descartes, sought in the soul for the best evidence of the existence of God. Goethe puts into a poem, —

> "Hail to the Unknown, the
> Higher Beings
> Felt within us." — p. 113.

A tendency to piety was beginning to be in motion; and Goethe at once sings of absolute resignation to the calamities, which are sown around us by "the benignant lightnings" of the "most holy Eternal Father."

> "Humbly I kiss the
> Hem of his garment,
> Filled with the awe of
> A true-hearted child." — p. 111.

The Greek superstitions blended strangely the idea of the Providence of the Gods, and the irresistible power of the Fates, and Goethe writes anew the

> "Song of the Parcæ, which they shuddering sang,
> When Tantalus fell from his golden seat." — pp. 118, 119.

But the characteristic of Goethe's times is, that the destructives had been at work, filling the world with ruin. Goethe

writes a poem, and it is one of his very best, in the very spirit of the Titans: —

" When I was a child,
And knew not whence or whither,
I would turn my wildered eye
To the sun, as if up yonder were
An ear to hear to my complaining —
A heart, like mine,
On the oppressed to feel compassion.

Who helped me,
When I braved the Titans' insolence?
Who rescued me from death,
From slavery?
Hast thou not all thyself accomplished,
Holy-glowing heart?
And, glowing young and good,
Most ignorantly thanked
The slumberer above there?

I honor thee! For what?
Hast thou the miseries lightened
Of the down-trodden?
Hast thou the tears ever banished
From the afflicted?
Have I not to manhood been moulded
By omnipotent Time,
And by Fate everlasting,
My lords and thine?" — pp. 106, 107.

Again, the Spiritualists represented the creation of the world by the power of the Logos. Goethe takes his admirers back to the creation; he represents the essences of all things present before the Word; and the World-Soul by the Word gives visible, tangible, sensible forms to all changing existences.*

* As a specimen of the notes with which Mr. Dwight has enriched the volume, we quote from his commentary on this poem: —

" Of this singular poem a word may be said; for, though in general such things had better be left to explain themselves, yet here, to help out somewhat an imperfect translation, it may be well to state what idea of it I had, while translating it. It is an attempt to embody in poetic, emblematic form, the sublimest flight of which the soul is capable in the region of pure speculation, where literal language wholly fails.

"WORLD-SOUL.

Disperse ye now to all remotest regions
From this high Festival!
Sweep through the zones, ye heavenly-winged legions,
And fill, fill out the All!

Far, far ye float, a heavenly vision beaming
On blessed Spirits' sight,
Or 'mid the social stars hang sweetly gleaming
In realms thick-sown with light.

"The whole difficulty of understanding it lies in the first verse. The point of view from which the poem proceeds, and to which the reader must transport himself, is so sublime and unattempted in most men's thoughts, that, hardly dreaming it possible to wing himself up to it, he will, perhaps, look at the poem only from the outside, and see nothing but strange confusion. The poet's starting-point here is no less than the heart of the Absolute itself. From here he looks out through creation, instead of looking back, as we do, from the creation to its unknown Cause. From the centre of Unity, of the Real, the Self-Existing, Causal Essence, he contemplates the Many, the Phenomenal, the world of effects, the infinite diversity of individual organizations, proceeding forth. It is but another aspect of the 'One in All.' As we observe the world around us, and all finite natures, we soon discover that these are not real, in the highest sense; inasmuch as no form preserves its identity two successive moments, but there is a perpetual flux going on throughout all matter. The real thing, therefore, we do not see. Under all this Changeable, the soul immediately supposes an Unchangeable, a Real, Self-existing, which is the ground of all its changes; which is the ground of all we see; which would be, were that taken away, and without which that would not be. All things, therefore, in essence are one; in form only are they many.

"Around the throne of this Unity, then, the poet imagines all things met in Essence. He calls it a 'holy festival.' It is the jubilee of Spirit, flowing back out of its separate individual channels, and enjoying its identity, and now just on the eve of creation again, about going forth to organize itself in all forms, as sun, star, mineral, plant, animal, man. Spirit, which in itself, in the repose of its completeness, is One, is all, being now considered as about putting forth its causal energies, multiplies itself, and, in poetic language, sends out its 'heavenly-winged legions'—armies of 'Monads'—on their creative mission in all directions through the All. Then follow, in the other verses, the successive orders of organized natures, ending with Man, whose individual life is only of time, and in the flame of love and aspiration goes out, and finds itself again in the Whole.

"'Into the All receiving
Your life as thence it came.'"

Anon fierce comets, far away ye blaze,
Immeasurably far,
Crossing at will the intertangled maze
Of circling sun and star.

Speed on, speed on, ye young creative forces!
Snatch up the shapeless earths,
And swing them off upon their measured courses,
Renewed through endless births.

Ye waft the circling seasons round, the changes
Of sunshine and of storm;
From you the caverned rock, the mountain-ranges,
Do take their fixed, firm form.

See now all things with godlike ardor striving
Their bounds to overleap;
The watery waste would fain grow green and thriving;
No grain of dust can sleep.

Work on! work on, with fondest, restless yearning;
Live through this dark, dank night!
I see a boundless Paradise far burning
In ever-shifting light!

Now lift themselves to light, like strange-shaped shadows,
The animated throng!
And Ye, surprised, stand there on earth's fresh meadows,
First Mortal Pair! Erelong,

In mutual smiles, your boundless heavenward striving,
Melts into air, like flame.
Rejoice ye, then, into the All receiving
Your life as thence it came." — pp. 147, 148.

And, finally, to take but one instance more, Spiritual Pantheism came in vogue in Germany, and Goethe too makes rhymes on the "One and All."

"How yearns the solitary soul
To melt into the boundless whole,
And find itself again in peace!
The blind desire, the impatient will,
The restless thoughts and plans are still;
We yield ourselves — and wake in bliss." — p. 151.

And in which of these poems does Goethe express his own convictions? Was he pantheist, or spiritualist, or atheist, or orthodox?

Of the songs, we should quote the one entitled "Vanitas! Vanitatum!" but it has been copied so extensively, as to show in what esteem it is held. Take, then, as a specimen of Mr. Dwight's lighter manner, the version of

"THE SON OF THE MUSES.

Through country and through city
I pipe my homely ditty,
  I weave my cunning rhyme.
I stroll about at leisure,
But always mind the measure;
  With me all goes by time.

I scarce can wait their coming —
The flowers of earliest blooming,
  That first peep out in Spring;
I sing them, though they are not;
If Winter comes, I care not;
  The fond old dream I sing.

I sing where no one listens,
Where ice all round me glistens:
  These are the Winter's *flowers!*
And when they melt, I wander
To the planted hill-side yonder,
  And still find pleasant hours.

The young folks, met for pleasure,
Move briskly to my measure
  Under the linden tree;
The stupid rustic, grinning,
The starch, prim maiden, spinning,
  Must own my melody.

Wings to my feet ye give me;
O'er hill and dale ye drive me;
  Your darling child must roam.
Say why, ye kindest Muses,
Your wiser will refuses
  To take the wanderer home?" — pp. 13, 14.

The division entitled "Parables, Epigrams, Proverbs," has attracted us. Take an example: —

> "*Goods* gone — something gone!
> Must bend to the oar,
> And earn thee some more.
> *Honor* gone — much gone!
> Must go and gain glory;
> Then the idling gossips will alter their story.
> *Courage* gone — all 's gone!
> Better never have been born!" — p. 187.

There is also a pleasing version of the poem "For Life," by Mr. James F. Clarke; but we have no room to extract it.

The latter part of the volume is filled with selections from a purer writer and a nobler man.

To the character of SCHILLER, there belongs a high tragic and moral interest and dignity. His tastes were exalted; his love of humanity, a consuming passion; his ardor for freedom and social progress, an absorbing feeling. His elevated hopes pervaded his lectures, his essays, his tragedies, his poems. He was ill at ease, restless, anxious; and how could it be otherwise? His genius was kindled with the divine light, which was to dawn upon the nations with healing in its beams; but it was not his happiness to behold it make its way through the clouds. For him the French Revolution seemed to have failed from the vices of its friends; from the despotism of its successors. The eagle of France was invading Germany; public virtue in sovereigns seemed exhausted; the people had not yet been disciplined into independent action. A deep gloom was settling on the prospects of his country. So much the more did Schiller turn inward. The darkness, which to him overspread the civil world, from the advancement of despotic power, was as thick as that darkness, which shut the bard of Paradise from "the sight of vernal bloom, or summer's rose," and, like Milton, Schiller maintained his faith, still nursed the undying flame within his breast, and his poems abound with sentiments like those of the bard of Paradise. He had within him a sanctuary. In the darkest hours he knew how to find hope within himself: —

> "So much the rather thou, celestial light,
> Shine inward, and the mind through all her powers

Irradiate; there plant eyes, all mist from thence,
Purge and disperse, that I may see and tell
Of things invisible to mortal sight."

Schiller, when the deepest gloom settled on the European world, preserved his trust unimpaired in the truths and in the providence which were to rescue freedom and virtue from a shipwreck. God, the soul, and freedom, ever were articles of his creed.

In early life Schiller broke away from the charms of patronage. "My ties," he exclaims, "are dissolved. The public is now my zeal, my sovereign, and my confidant. I belong to it exclusively. Before that tribunal and before none other will I plead. This only do I fear and reverence. I am elevated by the thought of bearing no chains but the decision of the world, of never again appealing to any other throne, than the soul of humanity." And he called on posterity to neglect the writer who was nothing in himself, who was only an artist and an author.

Schiller's life was of necessity a struggle. At the opening of this century it seemed to him that peace and freedom could nowhere find a refuge; and sternly reproving alike the military ambition at France, and the commercial avarice of England, he adds that the search on earth is vain for the happy region, where the garden of freedom preserves its freshness, and the beautiful youth of humanity its bloom." Alas! that Schiller knew so little of our America. Here his heart would have found repose. The poem, from which we have quoted, was written at the epoch, almost at the moment, of the election of Jefferson, just as our institutions were gaining the full confidence of the people, just as humanity was going forth upon a new morning of existence, and freedom was wreathing its freshest garland of evergreen.

Unable to derive tranquillity from watching the progress of humanity in our western hemisphere, Schiller sought relief by contemplating the calm virtues, the democratic liberty of Switzerland. His heart dwelt in the vales of Uri, and Unterwalden the rocky shores of the lake of Lucerne, by the consecrated scenes of Altdorf and Küssnacht, among the echoes that had known the voice, in the sequestered cantons that had borne the footsteps of William Tell. The poem, which commemorates the emancipation of the three cantons, is the masterpiece of Schiller's genius. In it he gave lessons in national indepen-

dence, in democratic freedom, in resistance to tyrants, in the inalienable right of the pure, laborious, peaceful tillers of the soil to govern themselves. The interest of the play rests not on William Tell, but with infinite art, which nothing but sincerity could have inspired, it is diffused through the little nations that were lifting themselves into political independence. In this, Schiller has not been equalled by poet or historian. And this conception was purely the creation of his own genius.

But the progress of despotism endangered even Switzerland. Schiller had no hope but in the unseen world. He sought to fly from the pressure of real life, into the tranquil capacious sanctuary of the heart, to cherish freedom, if it were but as a vision. As the hart for the water brooks, he panted for the realms of truth, which puny despots and time-servers could not invade. He had studied the whole history of man, and nowhere found his visions realized. "It is the dove," says a French biographer, "that quitted the ark to wander over all the earth, but finding nowhere rest for its wing, returned to its heaven-appointed shelter." The hour of death came to him at a season of deep dejection for the friends of liberty. As his dissolution drew near; just a few instants before his last breath, a friend inquired of him how he was, and received the answer, "calmer and calmer."

E'en then, says our own Bryant, whose character is kindred with Schiller's, though born in a happier land,

> "E'en then he trod
> The threshold of the world unknown;
> Already, from the seat of God,
> A ray upon his garments shone—
> Shone and awoke that strong desire
> For love and knowledge reached not here;
> Till death set free his soul of fire,
> To plunge into its fitter sphere.
> Then who shall tell, how deep, how bright,
> The abyss of glory opened round;
> How thought and feeling flowed, like light,
> Through ranks of being without bound!"

To dwell on Schiller's character is the less necessary, as the admirable life of him by Carlyle is so well known. The perusal of that life we commend to the young men of our country.

In the translations from Schiller, Mr. Dwight has been eminently successful. His version of the Song of the Bell, for

example, of which many versions have been made, is without compare the best; and some of his English competitors were skilful and experienced at the vocation. We notice also among the poems, Mr. Dwight has selected the song "To Joy," "The Artists," "The Ideal and Life," in which Schiller reveals his views of life, and of the duty of the poet. Here also is the sublime song "The Feast of Victory," which was the admiration of Madame de Staël. In all these, as in others, the poetic talent of Mr. Dwight is displayed most happily. "The German Muse" illustrates the independence of German literature, and bestows on it praise of which no part belongs to Goethe. In "Hope," and in the less successfully rendered "The words of Faith," in "The Ideal and Life," Schiller's own creed is delineated. Justice to Schiller compels us also to say, that Mr. Dwight has sometimes admitted from a friend a translation, which he would scarcely have tolerated from himself.

Yet to one of the contributors Mr. Dwight is largely indebted. The versions by Mr. Frothingham are of the highest merit. The diction is beautiful, terse, appropriate, and exact. The spirit is animated; the keeping perfect. "The Flowers," "The Festival of Eleusis," the "Cassandra," are all rendered by Mr. Frothingham, and each will more than justify the high praises we have bestowed; for they show the hand of one who is not satisfied with doing well, but strives to render his versions faultless. We met the other day a beautiful version of Schiller's Indian Death Song, by Sir John Herschel; in this volume we have a translation by Mr. Frothingham. We shall put them side by side, giving but the single remark, that Mr. Frothingham's version is literally exact.

THE INDIAN DEATH SONG.

SIR JOHN HERSCHEL'S VERSION.	N. L. FROTHINGHAM'S VERSION.
See, where upon the mat he sits, Erect before his door, With just the same majestic air Which once in life he wore.	On the mat he's sitting there: See! he sits upright, With the same look that he wore When he saw the light.
But where is fled his strength of limb, The whirlwind of his breath To the Great Spirit when he sent The peace-pipe's mounting wreath?	But where now the hand's clinched weight? Where the breath he drew, That to the Great Spirit late Forth the pipe-smoke blew?

Where are those falcon eyes which late
Along the plain could trace,
Along the grass's dewy wave
The rein-deer's printed pace?

Those legs which once with matchless speed
Flew through the drifted snow,
Surpassed the stag's unwearied course,
Outran the mountain roe?

Those arms once used with might and main
The stubborn bow to twang?
See, see, their nerves are slack at last,
All motionless they hang.

'Tis well with him, for he is gone
Where snow no more is found,
Where the gay thorn's perpetual bloom
Decks all the fields around.

Where wild birds sing from every spray
Where deer come sweeping by,
Where fish, from every lake, afford
A plentiful supply.

With spirits now he feasts above,
And leaves us here alone
To celebrate his valiant deeds
And round his grave to moan.

Sound the death song, bring the gifts,
The last gifts of the dead,
Let all which yet may yield him joy
Within his grave be laid.

The hatchet place beneath his head
Still red with hostile blood,
And add, because the way is long,
The bear's fat limbs for food.

The scalping knife beside him lay,
With paints of gorgeous dye,
That in the land of souls his form
May shine triumphantly.

Where the eyes, that, falcon-keen,
Marked the rein-deer pass,
By the dew upon the green,
By the waving grass?

These the limbs, that, unconfined,
Bounded through the snow,
Like the stag that's twenty-tyned,
Like the mountain roe!

These the arms, that stout and tense,
Did the bow-string twang!
See, the life is parted hence!
See, how loose they hang!

Well for him! he's gone his ways
Where are no more snows:
Where the fields are decked with maize,
That unplanted grows;—

Where with beasts of chase each wood,
Where with birds each tree,
Where with fish is every flood
Stocked full pleasantly.

He above with spirits feeds;—
We, alone and dim,
Left to celebrate his deeds,
And to bury him.

Bring the last sad offerings hither!
Chant the death lament!
All inter with him together,
That can him content.

'Neath his head the hatchet hide,
That he swung so strong;
And the bear's ham set beside,—
For the way is long;—

Then the knife,—sharp let it be,—
That from foeman's crown,
Quick, with dexterous cuts but three,
Skin and tuft brought down;—

Paints, to smear his frame about,
Set within his hand,
That he redly may shine out
In the spirits' land.

We close our desultory criticism with repeating our conviction, that the volume which we have reviewed is the best volume of translations from the German poets in our language.

The work does high honor to Mr. Dwight, who has our best wishes for his literary success. A genuine love of letters, a spirit that has confidence in truth, that is not alarmed by inquiry, a catholic willingness to appreciate excellence of the most opposite kind, mark the character of the Notes, which he has happily appended. They prove him to have reflected deeply, to have given careful thought to his winning employment. In connexion with the poems, they call up for consideration most of the principal German theories of philosophy. There is not a word of illiberality, not a rash, sweeping criticism in all his notes. He seems resolved on appreciating every one's merit; and this amiable and honorable quality is a sufficient defence, even if his speculations should not all be received, and if he should be charged with excess of admiration for one at least of the poets, for whom his labors are winning new suffrages.

ART. VII. — *Travels in South Eastern Asia, embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China; with notices of numerous Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire; with Dissertations, Tables,* &c. By HOWARD MALCOM. In two volumes. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1839. 12mo. pp. 274 and 322.

MR. MALCOM was sent to the East as the deputy and representative of one of the great American Missionary Societies, to examine and adjust many points not easily settled by correspondence; to compare the various modes of operation in different missions; to survey the field; to compare the claims of proposed new stations; to comfort, encourage, and strengthen the missionaries in their arduous work; and to gather details on every branch of the subject on which the Board lacked information. In addition to the present publication, voluminous communications in relation to Mr. Malcom's official doings, inquiries, and conclusions are in possession of the Board which, it is intimated in the preface, will not be withheld from the examination of proper applicants. With the majority of the public we have had access only to the two volumes now before us, which, with exceptions to be noticed, have impressed us favor-

ably with the zeal, the perseverance, and the judgment employed by Mr. Malcom in the discharge of the duty assigned to him. The work consists of four parts, embracing Travels in Burmah; Digested Notes on the Burman Empire; Travels in Hindustan, Malaya, Siam, and China; and Dissertations, Tables, &c., with an Appendix, pictorial illustrations, and a map of South Eastern Asia. The claim of originality for the map should have been sustained by a distinct specification of the errors and omissions in previous maps that have been corrected and supplied, and of the instruments and observations by which the localities were ascertained. "Local surveys" and "recent unpublished maps and charts at the Surveyor General's office in Calcutta" are the best authorities, especially if in these are included Captain Pemberton's maps appended to his secret Report on the Burman frontier, which, however, we suspect is not the case; but when Mr. Malcom quotes mere "conversations with missionaries and other gentlemen," as furnishing corrections for his map, we suspect altogether the grounds on which it has been framed. The illustrations both in wood and steel are in general executed with spirit and taste; but among the specimens of Oriental languages, forming one of the steel engravings, we observe that the very pardonable mistake has been committed of giving a sentence in the Hindustanee language and Arabic character as a specimen of the Arabic language. The words of the Bengalee airs in the second volume are also incorrectly given, and these are not the only instances in which the reflection is suggested, that it is unsafe for an author to profess to quote even single words, much less sentences, in languages with which he is unacquainted.

There are many topics suggested by the perusal of these volumes which we must omit to notice; but it would be unjust to Mr. Malcom not to advert in the most prominent manner to the calm and just spirit of Christian charity, in which he has estimated the character and institutions of the people of those countries where he has travelled. This is the more remarkable, because it is in contrast with the hasty judgment often pronounced and the harsh language employed by other missionaries. They seem to regard it as a sort of Christian duty to deny to the objects of their benevolence the common virtues of social life and even the ordinary attributes of humanity. In the dark picture that is drawn there is scarcely a redeeming feature, as if man's moral nature did not still survive all the de-

grading and vitiating superstitions into which he has fallen, and as if he did not continue to be a subject of the moral government of that Being whose nature he has misunderstood and whose worship he has corrupted. We are very far from seeking to palliate the vices either of an idolatrous or of a Christian people: to exaggerate them is equally inconsistent with truth and justice; and as in the deepest debasement of the individual character we delight to trace some quality which has escaped entire pollution, so in the darkest aspect of national character we rejoice to perceive some rays of heavenly light, showing that God has not left himself wholly without a witness in the heart of man any more than in the world of nature. Man's moral nature is as permanent and indestructible as man himself. Nay his moral nature *is* man himself; for if you separate his moral principles, and feelings, and affections from man, what remain but those physical propensities, desires, and impulses, which identify him with an inferior order of beings? Wherever, therefore, we meet with a *man*, in whatever latitude or longitude he may be found, however ignorant and erring, however sinful and wretched, however poor and oppressed, we have met with a being possessing, and therefore necessarily exercising, more or less purely and strongly, the moral qualities inherent in his nature, showing by his very superstitions that he is groping after God, if haply he may find him, and by the daily intercourse of society and the tender relations of life, proving the strength or the weakness, but in all cases the real existence, of his moral principles and affections. If it were otherwise, if we had not this foundation to build upon, we should not be able to perceive on what rational grounds any expectation could be formed of that moral regeneration which it is the object of Missionary enterprise to accomplish. It is because He, who causes his sun to shine and his rain to descend on the just and on the unjust, has also continued to inspire mankind of all castes and hues in all ages and nations with the love and admiration of moral goodness, that we may hope for the universal and grateful reception of the brightest and most perfect manifestation of Himself and his will in the person and mission of Jesus Christ. Mr. Malcom, without apparently lessening in the slightest degree his conviction of the importance and necessity of a knowledge of the gospel to heathen nations, is yet able, with an enlarged spirit of Christian benevolence equally honorable to his head and his heart, to perceive much that commands re-

spect in their characters and institutions. Can there be a more beautiful picture of frank and unpretending hospitality than that which is presented in the following passage? Our Missionary traveller was proceeding in a small cutter from Maulmain to Tavoy and Mergui: —

"To avoid three or perhaps four days' delay in going round Tavoy point and up the river, I was set ashore, with a few articles of immediate necessity, at *Moung-magoung*, a small Burman village eight or ten miles' walk from Tavoy. It stands nearly a mile from the shore, with wide paths and good houses beautifully shaded by noble trees, especially the bunyatha or jack, a species of the bread-fruit. While the necessary preparations were being made I was conducted to the cool zayat, and was scarcely seated on its floor of split canes, when a woman brought a nice mat for me to lie on, another presented me with cool water, and the head-man went and plucked for me a half dozen of fine oranges. None sought or expected the least reward, but disappeared and left me to my repose. A constant succession of children, however, came to gaze at the foreigner, and some women, with babes on their hips, squatted at a little distance to gratify their curiosty; all however behaving with decorum and respect. In a Burman village the zayat is the only tavern. It consists of a shed with a floor raised three or four feet from the ground, and wide verandas to keep off the sun. The quality of the building varies with the wealth and generosity of the villagers. Some are truly splendid. As chairs and tables are out of the question, and as every traveller carries his own provisions, here is an ample hotel. The neighbors readily furnish water, and fruits seem free. A little fire kindled near cooks the rice; an hour's slumber follows the unpretending meal, and all things are ready for a start." — Vol. I. pp. 38, 39.

It will be observed that this is not merely an instance of individual liberality or kindness to a foreigner, but that there is an established public provision for the entertainment of all strangers and travellers; and that the manners of the people have received an impress from the institution, which is evinced by private individuals supplying conveniences and articles of consumption, in addition to the shelter provided at the expense of the village. The preceding extract relates to a Burmese village, and that which follows shows that a still more unbounded and generous hospitality is practised by the Karens, an interesting forest and mountain tribe found in the Burmese territories: —

"Though we lodged each night in the boat, we spent our time and ate among the people. The glance thus gained at native character was very gratifying. We saw no house where poverty seemed to dwell (though we passed through four or five villages) and no disorder in any place. Whenever we stopped to eat we entered a house freely, and were immediately offered clean mats, and treated with the utmost hospitality. Able and willing to supply our wants, they sometimes expostulated with the servant as he was cooking our meals, that he had brought rice and fowls, instead of allowing them to furnish our table. This trait is prevalent among the Karens. Native assistants go from village to village among them, even where the gospel has never been heard, and take literally neither scrip nor purse. They are bountifully supplied, even where their message meets only with opposition. Mr. Vinton, on one occasion, went several days' journey among Karen villages, without servant or food. Everywhere they killed for him their best fowls, and spread before him rice, fruits, and honey, and whatever they had, and gave him their best place to sleep." — Vol. I. p. 57.

Thus, even hostility to the religion which the missionary teaches does not place him beyond the pale of their kindness. In another passage, (p. 90,) Mr. Malcom speaks not only of the hardihood, skill, and energy, but also of the good humor of Burmese boatmen. "The strength and energy with which they surmount difficulties transcend anything I ever saw among the boatmen on our own western waters, and in point of temper and morality, they are immeasurably superior. In this trip, and my various previous ones, I have never seen a quarrel, or heard a hard word. Cross accidents have occurred, and we have frequently been entangled with other boats, but all difficulties have been met and surmounted with good temper, and even hilarity." In a general estimate of the Burmese character, (p. 187–193,) while he dwells on the prevalence of thieving and pilfering, lying, intrigue, and chicanery, uncleanliness, &c., he at the same time illustrates the universality of habits of temperance, the general modesty of demeanor between the sexes, the affection of parents to their female as well as male children, the reverence of children for their parents, the deference shown for the aged, and the care and tenderness with which they are maintained when sick. Even of the Malays, whose revengeful disposition and habits of treachery are proverbial amongst Europeans throughout the East,

Mr. Malcom has the candor to remark, that "there is full reason to believe, that in intercourse with each other, domestic and private virtues prevail to as great an extent as among other heathen;" and, after an interview with the Pra Klang, or minister for foreign affairs at the Siamese court, at which fruits, sweetmeats, and cheroots (cigars) were frequently handed, and for drink, tea in little cups, and the juice of pine-apples in flowing bumpers, he exclaims, "How dignified, rational, and virtuous such beverages, compared to the spirituous potations, demanded by the hospitalities of more civilized races!" Our object in these references, is not to show that the natives of the East are immaculate and perfect models of every virtue, but that they have good as well as bad qualities, and that there is a disposition on the part of our author, the absence of which we have often had occasion to lament in others, to do them justice, by bringing into view the favorable as well as the unfavorable side of the picture. In this view, Mr. Malcom's concluding remarks on the Burmese character are distinguished by impartiality and good sense: —

"This brief delineation of character may serve to show how distorted and partial are the views which mere theorists take of heathen society. Formerly, it was the fashion to ascribe the greatest purity and dignity to an uncivilized and primitive state of manners, and to expatiate on the crimes, follies, and effeminacy of more artificial and polished communities. More recently, it has been the fashion to consider all, who have not received our customs and our religion, as sunk in degradation; devoid of every natural and moral excellence, and destitute of every species of human happiness. The truth, as to Burmah at least, lies between these extremes."

The same discrimination is shown in estimating the character and effects of the Burmese religion; for while, on one occasion, (p. 60,) we find Mr. Malcom speaking with even exaggerated contempt of what he admits to be "a harmless and merry custom," yet elsewhere, (p. 66,) he maintains, that "the morals of the people would greatly suffer by the loss of their religious system, if no other were to be substituted." But the most remarkable passage illustrating this view, is the following: —

"No false religion, ancient or modern, is comparable to this. Its philosophy is, indeed, not exceeded in folly by any other; but its doctrines and practical piety bear a strong resemblance to

those of holy Scripture. There is scarcely a principle or precept in the Bedagat which is not found in the Bible. Did the people but act up to its principles of peace and love, oppression and injury would be known no more within their borders. Its deeds of merit are in all cases either really beneficial to mankind, or harmless. It has no mythology of obscene and ferocious deities; no sanguinary or impure observances; no self-inflicted tortures; no tyrannizing priesthood; no confounding of right and wrong, by making certain iniquities laudable in worship. In its moral code, its descriptions of the peace and purity of the first ages, of the shortening of man's life because of his sins, &c., it seems to have followed genuine traditions. In almost every respect, it seems to be the best religion which man has ever invented."

This is high praise; and although qualified, it is not lessened, by the essential atheism of the religion thus described, and by its doctrine of merit, which, according to our author, produces selfishness and pride, and would annihilate sympathy, tenderness, benevolence, and gratitude, had not the divine hand "planted the rudiments" of these virtues "in the human constitution." To our mind there is something very cheering in this view of the moral character and religious systems of the heathen world. No one who justly appreciates the light which the gospel has shed on the path of duty in a present world and on the hopes of the world to come, and estimates aright the darkness which veils both worlds to the minds of those on whom that ligh thas not shone, can doubt that Christianity is the last best gift of God to man, and that man owes no higher duty to man than to diffuse its glorious influences. But, while we cherish this conviction in all its strength, we yet feel it to be exhilarating to reflect, when we cast our eyes over the vast expanse of the heathen world and the hundreds of millions of human beings whom it includes, that the divine image impressed on the soul of man has not been effaced even under the most unfavorable circumstances, and that the errors into which he has fallen, however gross and degrading, do not and cannot destroy the never dying principles of his moral and spiritual nature. If, after the necessarily superficial view which Mr. Malcom took of the countries he traversed, he found so many redeeming features in the character and religion of the people, is it not probable that a nearer insight into native character and society would have revealed a depth of devotional feeling, a strength of practical piety, an amount of social

excellence, and treasures of domestic affection, of which no account has been taken? In the heathen as well as in the Christian world, in every human soul, even in those unblessed with the special revelations of the Almighty, there is a perpetual contest going on between light and darkness, between truth and goodness on the one hand, and error and evil on the other. The powers of darkness often triumph; but nowhere do they triumph without a struggle, perpetually maintained, even in the midst of disaster and defeat. Christianity has an ally even in those hearts in which error has obtained the ascendancy, and when the light of nature is reinforced by the light of revelation, when the inherent love of truth and goodness which, however weakened, is never eradicated, shall be strengthened by the motives and examples of the gospel, presented in all their simplicity and urged in all their force, we should anticipate with confidence an encouraging degree of success. Let not missionaries, at least, raise obstacles in their own path, by rejecting the aids which the state of morals and of religion, of society and of literature in heathen countries presents. Everything heathen is not to be proscribed. Even in Christian countries we derive from past systems of heathen literature some of our noblest inspirations, and the institutions of modern heathenism sometimes afford most invaluable instruments of good, if we will deign to employ them. Those whom we are accustomed somewhat contemptuously to designate as heathens, are human beings, and all human beings are God's moral and rational creatures, framed in his image, and partaking of his spirit, which he has breathed into all, and denied not to them.

In strange contrast with the generally liberal tone of Mr. Malcom's sentiments towards Burmans, Karens, Malays, &c., it is with surprise that we find him exhibiting a different spirit towards others, certainly not less entitled to a just estimation of their principles and conduct; and after the terms of respect which we have employed towards him, it is not without pain that we are compelled to speak in the language of censure. The illiberal spirit to which we refer is directed both against the liberal Hindoos of Calcutta and the Roman Catholics of China, in both instances originating apparently in a sectarian bias of mind, and in both instances the means of correction being supplied by Mr. Malcom's own very ample admissions, so that we seem to have two Mr. Malcoms rolled up in one; one candid, discriminating, and judicious, and the other distinguished

by precisely the opposite qualities. Thus, in attempting to show the inexcusableness of China for continuing in idolatry, Mr. Malcom pronounces a high but deserved eulogy on the Roman Catholics who so nobly preceded the Protestant Church in their missionary labors and sacrifices: —

"Under Innocent IV., in the thirteenth century, the Monguls were made acquainted with Christianity. When Portugal spread her power over the East, her ministers everywhere carried the knowledge of the true God; and every Catholic country in Europe furnished missionaries and money. Whatever may be said of the priests, who from that time pressed the introduction of Christianity, and of the corruptions they mixed with it, still it was the glorious doctrine of the Divine Unity. The true God was set before them. Every part of the empire was pervaded by the discussion of the new faith. Prime ministers, princesses, queens, and emperors, became converts and patrons. Thousands and tens of thousands saw and acknowledged the truth. Numerous distinguished youth were taught and trained by a body of priests, distinguished in all ages for learning and science. True, they were Jesuits; but that very many of them were holy and devoted men, is proved by their pure lives, severe labors, innumerable privations, and serene martyrdom. The youth thus taught formed the flower of the country, and never could have divested themselves of the conviction of the folly of Boodhism. It was not till the comparatively late period of 1722, when the emperor Yung Ching set himself furiously to the work, that persecution became wholly destructive; nor was Christianity wholly put down, and the places of worship demolished, till the reign of Kea-king, who came to the throne in 1795. Even now, there are Catholic Christians scattered over the country. Many of their priests remain, and almost every year fresh ones contrive to enter; while native preachers keep together, here and there, little bodies of disciples. Thus, almost without cessation, has China been summoned to forsake her abominations." — Vol. II. pp. 189, 190.

There is here no apparent indisposition to recognise Roman Catholic Missionaries as suffering and laboring in the same cause with their Protestant brethren, in teaching the glorious doctrine of the Divine Unity, and in summoning the people of China to forsake their abominations, and it is for Mr. Malcom to reconcile this merited tribute to their zeal, their long-suffering, and their persevering devotedness, with the sentiment expressed in the following passage. "*It is a great mercy that China*

should be shut at present to Christian teachers. Were it otherwise Protestants are without persons to send, *while Popish priests abound in the East and would instantly enter in great numbers, making the field worse for us, if possible, than now.*" (p. 166.) O what a falling off is here! The inconsistency of this language with the preceding is its least demerit. A great mercy that China is shut to Christian teachers — that a third of the human race are deprived of the possibility of hearing the sound of the gospel by the unrighteous and tyrannical act of a despotic government! Does Mr. Malcom reflect on the impiety of thus confounding the act of Him who wills that all men should be saved and should come to the knowledge of the truth, with that of those who in ignorance or in pride raise barriers to its progress? Does he reflect on the self-condemnation he has pronounced, when he declares that "for us," that is, for Protestant Missionaries, China would present a worse field after the labors of Popish priests, who by the sacrifices they make and the dangers to which they expose themselves prove that they are the worthy successors of those holy and devoted missionaries whom he has eulogized, than it is now without any such previous culture? But we are unwilling to dwell on this painful exhibition. The account given of Rammohun Roy and the liberal Hindoos of Calcutta contains no sentiment so revolting as that to which we have just adverted, but it is inconsistent with itself, it is incorrect in important matters of fact, and on the whole presents a distorted, prejudiced, and imperfect view of the character and labors of the distinguished Reformer whom we have mentioned, and of the liberal Hindoos of Calcutta. As it contains a good deal that may interest our readers we present it entire in this place: —

"The conspicuousness of the late Rammohun Roy, and the eclat given for a time to the reformation, which he was supposed to be effecting, called me to his meeting with feelings of no ordinary interest. The Rev. Mr. Lacroix, to whom the language is perfectly familiar, kindly took me to the *Bromha Sobha*, as the congregation is called, and interpreted for me the substance of the various exercises. We found the place to be a commodious hall, in a respectable Hindu dwelling-house. There was no idol, or idolatrous representation of any kind. On a small stage, raised about eighteen inches from the floor, handsomely carpeted, sat cross-legged two respectable-looking pundits. One side of the room was spread with clean cloths for the native attend-

ants, who sat after the manner of the country; and on the other were chairs for the accommodation of strangers. In the centre, and opposite to the rostrum, lay some native musical instruments, and a violin. The room was well lighted, and the punkas of course waved overhead.

"One of the pundits opened the services by reading Sunscrit, from a loose palm-leaf held in his hand, stopping at every two or three words, to expound and enforce. The subject was *knowledge* — what it was, and what it was not, &c. Abstract ethical questions were discussed, not unlike the fashion of the old scholastics; but no moral deductions were made, nor anything said to improve the hearers. The whole discourse must have been unintelligible to most of them.

"The other then read a discourse in Bengalee, consisting chiefly of explanations of their religious system, and encomiums on it. He particularly dwelt on its liberality; boasting that they quarrelled with no name or persuasion; and assuring us, that it was of no consequence, whether we worshipped idols, Mahomet, Jesus Christ, or the Virgin Mary; that it was not possible to come to any certain knowledge respecting religious things; and that if any man believed his way to be right, that way was right for him. These discourses extended to about an hour; and the rest of the time, about another hour, was occupied with music. At the close of the preaching, professed musicians advanced to the instruments, and, seating themselves on the mats, put them in tune, with the usual amount of discord. Two of them then sang several hymns, with instruments accompanying it. The themes were the unity of the Divine Essence, and the various attributes of majesty and power. No one joined the strain, nor were there any books to enable them to do so. Nothing could be less reverent or devotional, than the manner of the musicians. They looked about them with all possible self-complacency, making unmeaning gestures, bowing and blinking to each other, and vociferating with such a nasal twang, that it was a relief when they had finished. I thought it was literally such music as the poet speaks of — intended 'to soothe savage breasts;' for, certainly, no other could well endure it.

On their retiring, a very different singer took the place, and proceeded for half an hour with great power of execution, and not a little taste. His voice was uncommonly fine. He accompanied himself skilfully on the native guitar. The violin had been well played from the beginning, and the music was now truly excellent, furnishing, I was informed, a fair specimen of the best Bengal art. The singer, as well as the violinist, is distinguished at the nautch entertainments of the city. The subject

was still the attributes of God. The Bengalee language has, for this purpose, a noble advantage over ours, in numerous expressions derived from the Sunscrit, which utter in a *single word* what may be called the negative attributes, and which we cannot express with brevity; such as, 'He that needs no refuge;' 'He that is never perplexed;' 'He that can never grow weary,' &c. The singer used these epithets with great majesty; using animated gestures, and with a countenance finely varying with the theme. At the close of this exercise, the assembly broke up.

"No female was present, nor do any ever attend. Most of the congregation came in only in time to hear the music, and stood near the staircase, not without disorder. The number of the regular attendants was not over twenty. I am informed, thirty is the largest number ever present. The spectators were somewhat more numerous.

"Few of the professed adherents are so confident of their rectitude, as to detach themselves wholly from the common religious customs, though more negligent in these matters than their neighbors. The very pundits officiate, not because converts to these opinions, (for such they do not profess to be,) but because regularly *paid* for their services. One of them, in his discourse this evening, expressly told us that there was no impropriety in worshipping idols — a doctrine which Rammohun Roy would not admit. The musicians also are paid, and perform here for the same reasons that they do at a nautch, so that the whole concern is sustained by the money of a few friends, and descendants of Rammohun Roy.

"Such is the boasted reformation of Rammohun Roy! Not another congregation of his followers is found in all India! Of his labors as a reformer, this is the sum: — Fifty or a hundred persons rendered negligent of the national religion, or gathered here because they were so before, without being a whit the better in their private life or public influence; in some cases, adding the sins of Europeans to those of their countrymen; without being disentangled from the horrid system of the Shasters; without being ready, or without the moral courage, to restore to their own wives and daughters the rights of human nature. With all the superiority to prejudice and custom, boasted by Rammohun Roy, he did nothing for the elevation of the sex.

"A striking instance of this occurred, not very long since, in the case of D. T., one of his most intelligent followers. This gentleman is a partner in a European house, in the habit of mixing with European gentlemen, and evidently much more enlightened than most of his countrymen. Yet was he so much

under the influence of Hindu public opinion, as to marry his daughter to a Ku-len Brahmin, for the purpose of elevating the family above the reproach occasioned by one of his ancestors, with many others, having been compelled to eat beef, by a Mahometan enemy named Per Ali. The young lady is well educated, reads and writes English, and is remarkably intelligent. The Brahmin is as ignorant as the rest of his class, and will probably marry others, as avarice or caprice may move him. Brahmins of this caste may marry *any number* of wives, but are not bound to live with them. They not unfrequently leave a wife after a few weeks, and never see her again. She is thus doomed to hopeless widowhood, merely to gratify the ambition of her family. Thus completely is Rammohun Roy's principal disciple under the influence of a thraldom, which that great man professed to despise. A good school would have done more than all that has been accomplished by the Bromha Sobha. We should expect pupils, who had become so far released from Hindu prejudice, to advance to a complete emancipation. But this people show no tendency to advance; they have long stood still; and everything already wears an aspect of decrepitude and decay. What a monument of the entire inefficacy of unassisted reason, to ameliorate the religious condition of any people! Already may the undertaking of this truly great man be pronounced a failure; and soon all traces of it will be lost from the earth.

"Rammohun Roy established a weekly newspaper, called the Reformer, which was intended chiefly to excite among those Hindus, who understand English, a desire for improvement in their civil condition. It is yet continued, edited by an intelligent native; though incorporated now with a Calcutta paper, conducted by a European. It has often contained well-written papers against Churruck Pooja, Ku-len marriages, and the other abominations of the Hindu system, and is, doubtless, as at present conducted, a valuable journal.

"Rammohun Roy was not a Unitarian Christian, but a Unitarian Hindu. He believed that there was such a person as Jesus Christ, and that he was the best moral teacher the world ever saw; but regarded his death as having no efficacy of atonement. His capacious mind, and extensive knowledge of the Shasters, impelled him to abhor the abominations of the Veda, and the monstrosities of its thirty-three millions of gods. But he found in the Vedanta Sar, (an exposition of the four Vedas,) a sort of Unitarianism, which he endeavored on all occasions to disseminate. The doctrine might as well be called pantheism; for it maintains the old Pythagorean doctrine, that God is the soul of the world, and that every animal, plant, or stone, is therefore part of Deity.

It makes perfect religion to consist in knowledge alone, or the realizing in everything the Supreme Being; and excludes ceremonies of all kinds." — Vol. II. pp. 30 – 33.

In this account there are several mistakes, which are worthy of notice only as showing the loose form in which Mr. Malcom must have received his information, or the inadequate authority on which it rests. Rammohun Roy did not establish the weekly newspaper in the English language, called "The Reformer." At different periods he established and conducted the *Mirat ool Ukkbar* in Persian, and the *Sambad Caumudi*, in Bengalee. He did not abhor the abominations of the Veda, and the monstrosities of its thirty-three millions of gods, inasmuch as such monstrosities and abominations are not found in the Veda. As a Unitarian, it was his express object and endeavor to revive among his countrymen in Bengal, the pure forms of faith and worship taught in the Veda, which, in his opinion, were as distinct from the absurdities of the modern Hindu mythology, as is the New Testament from the legends of the Romish church. The *Vedanta Sar* is not an exposition of the four Vedas, but of the Vedanta system, that one of the six Hindu theologico-philosophical schools, which is expressly founded on the spiritual portions of the Vedas, and which most fully and satisfactorily maintains and illustrates the doctrine of the divine unity and the spirituality of the divine nature. The Vedanta Sar is a modern and unauthoritative exposition of the doctrines of this system; and it was not in that work that he found the "sort of Unitarianism" which he taught his countrymen, but in the Upanishads, or spiritual portions of the Vedas, some of which he first printed both in original and translation.

These are small matters. Nor do we greatly blame Mr. Malcom, when he describes Rammohun Roy as being not a Unitarian Christian, but a Unitarian Hindu; as teaching a sort of Unitarianism, which he calls pantheism; as maintaining that God is the soul of the world, and that every animal, plant, or stone is part of the Deity; and as making perfect religion consist in knowledge alone; for these are misapprehensions which are probably common to him with many others. That Rammohun Roy was not a Unitarian Christian to the extent of a full and undoubting recognition of the authority of Christ as a teacher sent from God, we believe Mr. Malcom correctly

affirms; but we are equally satisfied that he is mistaken in stating that Rammohun Roy was a Unitarian Hindu. It might with equal truth be affirmed that he was a Musalman, since it was from the Koran that he first derived his belief in the Divine Unity, and to the latest period of his residence in India he maintained friendly relations with learned and intelligent adherents of that faith. In the strict sense of these terms, he was none of the three, for he held only what is common to all, without admitting or denying what is peculiar to each. He believed that the Unity of God, taught equally in its purity by Unitarian Christians, by Unitarian Hindus, and by Musalmans, was the great and fundamental doctrine of all religion, and that the maintenance and diffusion of it would be the most effectual means of striking a fatal blow at polytheism, idolatry, and superstition, and all their degrading influences. This appears to us to have been his master-thought, the leading conception which tinged and moulded, penetrated and pervaded all his ideas, and plans, and publications; and we hold, too, that it was a conception worthy of the master-mind that formed it. Even Unitarian Christians, we believe, with all their tendency to exaggerate the importance of the doctrine from which they are named and characterized, take in general a very narrow and inadequate view of its comprehensive bearings, especially in idolatrous, polytheistic, and atheistic communities. Of the various systems of faith existing among his countrymen, he selected that of the Vedant school as the purest and most enlightened; but we have no idea that he would have held himself bound to an unquestioning adoption of all its dogmas. The Vedanta system may be regarded either as a system of religion or of philosophy. As a system of religion, it certainly "makes perfect religion consist in knowledge alone"; not, however, in knowledge as a mere intellectual exercise or acquirement, but in the true knowledge of God as distinguished from the outward observances of mere ceremonial worship; and in this it teaches the very doctrine of the Apostle Paul, that by the works or observances of the law, no flesh living can be justified. So far from knowledge *in intellectu* being regarded as of exclusive importance, we have no hesitation in saying that, out of the sacred Scriptures, we have met with no more touching or sublimer expressions of devotional feeling, — touching and sublime from their very simplicity, — than those that are to be found in the spiritual portions of the Vedas, which

constitute the bases and authorities of the Vedanta system. It is not improbable that future research may trace the first germ of Gnosticism to this system; and when we look at it as a system of philosophy, it is still more obvious that we discover in it the original type of Bishop Berkeley's theory respecting the immateriality of the visible world, or rather his doctrine respecting the absence of proof to establish its materiality. The pantheism, — if pantheism it may be called, — which Mr. Malcom describes, we believe to be wholly unknown to the Vedant. To our apprehension, indeed, pantheism is not identical with maintaining that God is the soul of the world; and, from the supposition that God is the soul of the world, it does not follow, that every animal, plant, or stone is part of the Deity, any more than it follows from the union of the human soul with the human body, that every limb of the latter is part and parcel of the former. However this may be, no such pantheism is taught in the Vedanta. Its cardinal doctrine is that God alone has a true and real existence; that he alone is, and that all other beings and objects exist only in our conceptions, possess only an imaginary and delusive subsistence. In the struggling efforts of the human mind to form the purest possible conception of the divine nature, the followers of the Vedanta philosophy teach that God is a being who cannot be correctly described by epithets, as great and powerful, good, just, and true. He is not great and powerful, but greatness and power; not good, and just, and true, but goodness, justice, and truth. God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him as true and essential spirit. This may be philosophy falsely so called, or it may contain a vein, to be yet farther worked, of pure religion and of sound philosophy; but it is not at least Mr. Malcom's pantheism, nor did Rammohun Roy "endeavor on all occasions" or on any occasion "to disseminate" such doctrines as are ascribed to him.

To misapprehend the doctrines of a school of Hindoo philosophers and theologians, may appear a very pardonable offence in a passing traveller; and even when this misapprehension involves grave misrepresentations, confidently delivered, of the doctrines taught by the most distinguished Hindoo reformer of modern times, and still maintained by his followers and friends, we are disposed rather to express our regret than to pronounce a severe censure. But when we find him not merely misunderstanding unfamiliar speculations, but overlooking palpable

and important facts, within the reach of any inquirer, and even broadly condemning Rammohun Roy for his neglect of a department of philanthropic labor, in which his merits were most prominent and undeniable, we feel that the language of condemnation may be retorted without injustice. Mr. Malcom remarks that "a good school would have done more than all that has been accomplished by the Bromha Sobha," the weekly meeting of Rammohun Roy's followers which he established for the purposes of worship and instruction, the implication being that he neglected and undervalued education. If, in estimating the character and labors of Rammohun Roy, Mr. Malcom had taken the same comprehensive view as that with which he regarded the Burmese religion, he would not have sought to depreciate the establishment of this periodical assembly in a nation of idolaters, possessing in their own institutions not even the conception of what we mean by united worship of the Deity, and public moral and religious instruction. But whatever the merit or success of Rammohun Roy in presenting this conception to the minds of his adherents, and in attempting to give it the practical force of a habit, he did not for this object, as is implied by Mr. Malcom, undervalue the importance of education, or neglect the means of promoting it among his countrymen. He promoted it by the most disinterested sacrifices, both by what he did and by what he left undone. He promoted it by consenting to remain a silent and inactive spectator when that useful and efficient institution, the Hindoo College, was established at the suggestion of European gentlemen by the wealthy Hindoos of Calcutta, about the year 1815, a time when the prejudice against him ran very high among his countrymen, and when he was assured by his European friends that his interference and support would prove more hurtful than salutary, by alarming the jealousy and calling into activity the bigotry and intolerance of his opponents. But he was not always content to remain thus silent, especially when he judged that a wrong direction was about to be given to the efforts of the friends of education. When the Government Sanscrit College was about to be established, and when, as he supposed, a barren and merely oriental course of instruction was about to be prescribed, he remonstrated against such a design in a spirited letter to Lord Amherst, the Governor-General, from which Mr. Malcom quotes, (vol. ii. p. 25,) without apparently understanding the circumstances that called

it forth, or the special object he had in view, which was to show the comparative worthlessness of much of what is called Hindoo learning, and the value aud importance of the pure and useful science which he was desirous should be communicated from European sources to his countrymen. Subsequently, he built expensive school-rooms, and established a school at his own cost, both for the encouragement of the more useful branches of native learning, and for instruction in the English language and in the science and literature which it contains, although it was the latter department only that went into operation. Still more recently, entirely disregarding sectarian differences and distinctions, he gave his cordial and zealous support and influence to Mr. Duff in the establishment of the institution in Calcutta connected with the General Assembly of the church of Scotland for the promotion of native education; an institution formed and conducted on strictly Christian and Orthodox principles, and now numbering, we believe, about one thousand pupils. He encouraged also a public-spirited and wealthy friend and adherent to establish a large English school on his estate in one of the interior districts of Bengal, and to place it under the superintendence of the General Assembly's missionaries. These are merely desultory facts which occur to our recollection while we write; and if we had leisure or materials to fill up the outline, it would still more fully appear that Rammohun Roy was a steady, enlightened, and self-sacrificing friend of education, and that in assuming his indifference or neglect, Mr. Malcom only proves his own culpable carelessness in collecting information, or the prejudiced and untrustworthy character of the sources from which in this instance it has been derived.

Even this culpability dwindles into insignificance, when compared with the recklessness of truth and justice exhibited in the allegation, that "with all the superiority to prejudice and custom boasted by Rammohun Roy, HE DID NOTHING FOR THE ELEVATION OF THE (FEMALE) SEX." Rammohun Roy was not a man to boast of his superiority to prejudice and custom, much less would he boast of anything he did for the benefit of others; but that a friend of humanity and religion, professing to have formed a well-weighed estimate of his character from local inquiry, should assert that he did nothing for the elevation of the female sex, although it cannot now pain him, perhaps never could have pained his lofty and generous spirit, must sound

strangely in the ears of those who enjoyed his friendship, who witnessed his labors, and who continue to venerate his memory, even more for what he did in the cause of woman than in any other and all other causes whatsoever. To whom did Mr. Malcom apply, from whom did he obtain this information? The Rev. Mr. Pearce with whom, it appears, he resided in Calcutta; the Rev. Mr. Yates whom he eulogizes; the Rev. Mr. La Croix whom he employed as a Bengalee interpreter, all could, and no doubt would, have given him a very different account, for they are good men and true, and they know what were Rammohun Roy's unwearied and successful labors to preserve the lives and to vindicate the rights of hundreds of Hindoo women annually sacrificed by avarice, bigotry, and fraud, on the funeral piles of their deceased husbands. During the last nine years it has been, and it is at present, illegal for a Hindoo widow to burn after the death of her husband, or with his dead body, or for any one to aid and abet her in such a sacrifice of her life, throughout the wide extent of the British territories in India, embracing a population of nearly a hundred millions of human beings. Previous to the act prohibiting the practice, passed by the British Indian Government during Lord William Bentinck's Governor-Generalship, from three to four hundred widows were annually thus immolated. To whom does humanity owe the abolition of this murderous rite, the annual preservation of so many lives? We have heard with astonishment that this merit has, in this city, been claimed by, or attributed to, a well known traveller and lecturer, Mr. James Silk Buckingham, although it is probable that our information on this subject is incorrect; for that gentleman must be aware, that he had no more to do with the abolition of the practice than hundreds who lamented its existence, and expressed an opinion against its further toleration. To the distinguished and enlightened statesman we have mentioned as Governor-General of British India must doubtless be ascribed, in the first place and in the highest sense, the honor of achieving this bloodless and blood-saving triumph. But next to him, and before any one else, it belongs to Rammohun Roy. In weighing the whole subject, in resolving on the measure, and in considering the grounds on which it should be placed, in order that it might be accomplished effectually and safely, Lord William Bentinck was in frequent communication with Rammohun Roy, whose knowledge, experience, and advice were

highly valued. Long before this period, Rammohun Roy had been laboriously employed on the same subject, endeavoring both to awaken the attention of the British Government and of the European community to the enormity of the evil, and to enlighten the minds of his countrymen. For this purpose, he wrote at different times and extensively circulated several pamphlets, both in English and Bengalee, proving that it was not an essential doctrine of the Hindoo religion; that many authorities did not prescribe it; that the highest authorities did not make it obligatory, but left it optional; and that it was equally opposed to the dictates of religion and humanity. He also exposed the modern abuses of the rite, such as the administration of drugs to the victims to stupefy them, and the application of force to prevent their escape from the pile. Penetrating still more thoroughly than it was possible for a European to do the support which the practice derived from the despair of the unhappy victims and the cupidity of their relatives, he proved, in a separate tract, that widows, if they did not burn, instead of being treated, according to Hindoo custom, as menials in the houses of their deceased husbands, were entitled, according to Hindoo law, to a separate maintenance from their husbands' estates, and that this ought to be fully secured to them, so that they might have a motive to desire life, and the means to enjoy it in comfort and respect. By these means he equally exposed himself to the ill will of his countrymen who cherished a practice producing so many martyrs to the glory of the Hindoo religion and race, and of timid and ill-informed Europeans in office who dreaded the effect of abolition on the stability of the government. With little aid from others, amid many discouragements, he pursued his course; he held and made good his ground as he advanced; and he lived to witness the prohibition of the rite, to head a deputation of Europeans and natives to thank the Governor-General for the abolition of the practice, and to know that his countrymen had universally submitted to the measure almost without a murmur or objection. The philanthropist who thus wrote, and labored, and suffered, and triumphed, is he who, according to Mr. Malcom, *did nothing for the elevation of the female sex!*

The account given of a religious service, which Mr. Malcom witnessed at the Bromha Sobha, (Brahma Sabha,) is, we believe, generally correct; but the remarks interspersed show that the whole was regarded with a jaundiced eye by himself or his

interpreter. "Abstract ethical questions," we are told, "were discussed, not unlike the fashion of the old scholastics; but no moral deductions were made, nor anything said to improve the hearers. The whole discourse must have been unintelligible." It is difficult to understand how *ethical* questions should be discussed without *moral* deductions being made, or at least implied; and we should think, on the whole, that the preacher was a better judge of what would improve his hearers than two casual Christian spectators. But the worst that appears so far is, that the discussion of abstract questions, the revival of old scholastics, and the teaching of what is unintelligible, is not peculiar to Christian pulpits and orthodox preachers, which we must admit to be matter of regret.

If the introductory discourse, which appears to have been expository of a portion of the Vedas, and therefore somewhat obscure to those who were unacquainted with the original passage, was unintelligible, the same fault could not be found with the second address, which, according to Mr. Malcom, taught a lax indifference to all forms of worship and systems of belief, but which we should infer, even from his own account, taught the much more defensible doctrine of the salvability of the sincere in heart, whatever the errors of form and of faith into which they may fall. We have met with this doctrine in the writings of orthodox divines, amongst whom we may mention Bishop Heber, a writer whom Mr. Malcom quotes with respect. We think, also, that we have met with it in the writings of the Apostle Paul, and in a recorded discourse by the Apostle Peter. How easy it would have been, if "they that were of the circumcision" had listened with the *animus* of Mr. Malcom and his friend to the Apostle Peter's discourse, to have caricatured the declaration, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him," as teaching that it was of no consequence whether we worshipped idols, Mahomet, Jesus Christ, or the Virgin Mary. To sit in the seat of the scornful, is not the disposition of mind with which any one is likely to know of the doctrine whether it be of God.

Mr. Malcom does not stickle at assertions. Few of the adherents of this sect, it is alleged, are sincere and consistent; an assertion too general for us to refute, and, we should have supposed, too general for him to make. To their own master they stand or fall. The very pundits, the learned men who

conduct the services, do not officiate, it is added, because converts to these opinions (for such they do not profess to be). This is a specific charge, and can be met specifically. Ram Chandra Sarmana Vidyavagis has presided over the meetings of the Brahma Sabha, and conducted its services, since its first establishment by Rammohun Roy who regarded him with the affection and esteem of a personal friend. We know him to be profoundly learned, and we believe him to be a man of conscientious principles, of pure life, and of sincere piety. Any assistance he receives from other pundits is, we believe, occasional and desultory, and of these we cannot speak, because even in repelling what we believe to be a calumny, we will not permit ourselves to follow the bad example of speaking at random and in sweeping terms, of persons with whom we may be unacquainted. But the pundits are regularly *paid* for their services; and this is mentioned as a circumstance derogatory to their character by one who has, we are informed, himself officiated as a salaried pastor of a Christian congregation! The musicians too are paid, and perform for the same reasons that they do at a nautch, or native dancing-party; but Mr. Malcom omitted to add, in connexion with this fact, that the cathedral service of Calcutta, under the supervision of an orthodox and pious bishop, is regularly aided in its devotions by paid professional singers who perform at the Chouringhee Theatre.

After all this miserable carping, Mr. Malcom winds up with exclaiming, "Such is the boasted reformation of Rammohun Roy"! He attends a single service of two hours' duration, conducted in a language which he does not understand, and is dependent for every idea he receives on the interpretation of a gentleman whose vocation brings him almost daily into hostile conflict with those whose religion he is called on to explain, and against whom his feelings are embittered as the most formidable, because the most rational, opponents he encounters. The consequence is an account, in almost every line of which missionary prejudice and bigotry appear; and in this single service, so conducted, and so interpreted, and so understood, our missionary traveller finds materials sufficient to determine the value of the labors of a "truly great man," during the whole period of life; labors, carried on in England as well as in India embracing the reformation of religious opinion, of social manners, and of civil and political condition; conducted in at least four different languages, Persian, Sanscrit, Bengalee, and English; labors, which brought on him the displeasure of

Hindu brahmins, of Mohammedan maulavis, and of Christian bishops, priests, and missionaries; which made him an object of legal as well as of social persecution; which, under all disadvantages, have produced an important effect upon the face of Hindu society in Bengal, and which, with advancing years, will continue to be felt with accelerated force. Before Mr. Malcom and his informants can even comprehend Rammohun Roy's character and labors, they have yet much to learn, and we should perhaps add, much also to unlearn. Born a Hindu of the Hindus, as Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, he had every inducement to acquiesce in the system of religion which by divine right gave him so distinguished and privileged a place; but in early life he freed himself from the shackles of idolatry, and opened his mind to the grand and elevating idea of One Universal Father, which he retained with firm conviction to his latest breath. Nor was this a barren conception. His mind expanded in benevolence towards all his brethren of mankind, and his life was spent in their service. With an original capacity for metaphysical reasoning, refined and strengthened by cultivation in the school of Hindoo logic, he employed his profound and various learning to attack the complicated system of Hindoo idolatry, which in Calcutta we consider that he chiefly has contributed to shake to its foundations, although the time is probably yet far distant when it will wholly disappear from even a single city of India. In this controversy, even Christian missionaries have been glad to avail themselves of the resources brought into use by his acute mind, and to borrow arrows from his quiver without acknowledgment. He labored, as we have shown, in the cause of education. He labored to protect the rights and to save the lives of Hindoo widows. He took a deep interest in every political movement throughout the civilized world, favorable to civil and political liberty. He labored in conversation and by writing, through the medium of the press and by evidence given before Parliamentary Committees, during his residence in England, to give a right direction to the measures then in progress for the future government of British India. In his whole career, we see the good as well as the great man, the patriot and philanthropist as well as the philosopher; and the effect of such a career and of such an example, is not to be measured in the narrow spirit of sectarianism, inspired by those who opposed and counteracted him in life, and who now, since the grave has closed over him, would depreciate and misrepresent his labors.

Rammohun Roy employed none of the disciplinary tact and policy of John Wesley. He endeavored, indeed, to establish the forms and practice of public worship and instruction among his friends, but he did not attempt the systematic organization of a sect; and hence the futility of judging of the number of his followers, or the extent of his influence as a reformer, by the number and character of the auditors and attendants at the Brahma Sabha. That some few of these persons "add the sins of Europeans to those of their countrymen, without being disentangled from the system of the Shasters," is an assertion in conformity with common report in Calcutta, although we have not the knowledge that would enable us either to affirm or deny it. That none of them are "a whit the better in their private life or public influence" for the religion they profess, is an allegation, which, for its establishment, would require a much closer insight into their character than Mr. Malcom or any orthodox missionary has ever obtained, and which our intimacy with, and observation of, many of the individuals in question, compel us to reject as unfounded and unjust. But when he proceeds to say that the liberal Hindoos of Calcutta are not prepared, or have not the moral courage, "to restore to their own wives and daughters the rights of human nature," he shows an utter ignorance of what is going on in the native society of Calcutta. In conformity with the spirit and principles of Rammohun Roy, and with the dictates of their own hearts and minds, the liberal Hindoos of Calcutta are, above and beyond all others, anxious to restore to their wives and daughters the rights of human nature, in opposition to the cruel and immoral system of Kulin polygamy. No other division of the Hindoo community has stood forth as the assailant of this practice; nowhere have more indignant remonstrances, or better sustained arguments against it, appeared, than in "The Reformer," the organ and advocate of their peculiar views. The instance which he adduces to the contrary, of D. T. marrying his daughter to a Kulin brahman, is wholly without point, as far as the circumstances appear, of which we know nothing but what Mr. Malcom has detailed. Does he mean to condemn D. T. for seeking an alliance for his daughter with a man of purer caste than his own? In Christian countries it is not deemed derogatory to the Christian character for a father to seek a high connexion for his daughter by marriage; and, according to Hindoo notions, the effect in

the present case will be, not to raise the wife to the level of the husband, but to degrade the husband to the level of the wife. Does he mean to condemn D. T. specially for marrying her to a Kulin brahman? But because some of that caste marry more wives than one, it does not follow that others should not marry at all. Does he mean to condemn D. T. for marrying his daughter to a Kulin brahman who has married other wives? This he cannot mean, since he expressly says, that the Kulin brahman in question "will *probably* marry others"; whereas the probability appears to us to be, that D. T., for the sake of his daughter, will take care to prevent him from marrying others. This brahman, we are told, "is as ignorant as the rest of his class"; but Mr. Malcom has too readily adopted the common mistake, that the entire class of Kulin brahmans is ignorant, that they are all degraded, and make a demoralizing traffic of themselves. Some do so, and are despised; others respect themselves, reverence public opinion, and will not descend to such infamy. Rammohun Roy was a Kulin brahman, and abhorred Kulin polygamy; and we have known idolatrous Kulin brahmans, who have equally expressed their detestation of it. But admitting all that is assumed or insinuated respecting D. T. and his daughter's marriage, the injustice is committed of condemning a class for the act of a single individual, whom they had neither the power nor the right to control, as a father of a family, and whose conduct in this instance, if Mr. Malcom's view of it is just, is in direct opposition to the sentiments generally entertained by the body.

"But this people," we are assured, "show no tendency to advance; they have long stood still; and everything already wears an aspect of decrepitude and decay." — "Already may the undertaking of this truly great man be pronounced a failure; and soon all traces of it will be lost from the earth." The author had just before informed his readers, that the daughter of D. T., one of Rammohun Roy's most intelligent followers, "is well educated, reads and writes English, and is remarkably intelligent," — a description, which any one even moderately acquainted with Hindoo society, would know could apply only to a Hindoo female, on whose training the most assiduous and unusual attention had been bestowed. The liberal Hindoos of Calcutta are remarkable for this attention to the education of their children, female as well as male; for,

although they will not send their daughters to missionary schools, they either instruct them in person, or employ female teachers to attend in their families for that purpose. They have never been found backward in promoting every public-spirited and benevolent object,—the objects of the School Society, the School Book Society, the Hindoo College, the Government Committee of Public Instruction, the District Charitable Society. In these and in other philanthropic institutions, they have disinterestedly and liberally coöperated with other members of the community; and their exertions and contributions give no indications that they are standing still, without sharing or communicating the onward movement of society. They know the power of the press, and by means of newspapers wield an important influence. "The Reformer," which Mr. Malcom pronounces a valuable journal, containing well written papers against the Charak Puja, Kulin marriages, &c., is wholly in their hands; and on questions of public policy and philanthropy, we have oftener than once had occasion to admire the talent and acuteness its conductors have displayed, while most of their European contemporaries were in wandering mazes lost, for want of local experience and a just knowledge of native character and institutions. Other newspapers, "The Jnananweshan," "The Sambad Caumudi," &c., conducted with more or less ability, are or have been under their control; but the changes in their management are frequent, although the liberal tone is always preserved, and new journals of the same class are often started. As another proof of the mental activity and love of improvement excited among this class, it may be mentioned that about a twelve-month ago a society was formed among the liberal Hindoos of the rising generation, the express objects of which are to strengthen the bonds of fellowship among themselves, to promote the acquisition of knowledge, and to extend the sphere of their usefulness. In June, 1838, we attended the first meeting of the society, at which were present upwards of two hundred young men, some of whom delivered in the Bengalee language most animated and stirring addresses. All this shows that they are not the stagnant and inert body, the decaying and retrograde sect, which they are described to be. Whatever faults and imperfections may belong to them, and however they may be wanting in a principle of cohesion among themselves, it would be altogether unjust to regard them in any other light, than as the most intelligent and

actively benevolent division of Hindoo society in Calcutta. These, in fact, are the men of all others, through whom it may be hoped that improvement will be introduced into the very frame-work of Hindoo society, and into the systems of thought and action by which it is distinguished.

We have gone into these details with greater minuteness than we at first intended; and, in bringing them to a conclusion, we must express our entire conviction that there has been no intentional misrepresentation, although we cannot avoid deeply regretting, that Mr. Malcom should, without sufficient inquiry, have precipitately adopted from others such erroneous and unjust views of the character and labors of an interesting class of Hindoos, from whom much good may be expected; and especially of one, who made it his highest ambition to promote the welfare and improvement of mankind, and who lived, and toiled, and died for his countrymen.

It was our purpose to advert to other subjects which Mr. Malcom has discussed; in some instances to point out the valuable information he has supplied, and in others to express our doubts of the originality which appears to be claimed; in some, to express our assent to, and in others, our dissent from, the conclusions at which he has arrived, as to the measure of missionary success, and the mode of conducting missions. But we have already exceeded our limits, and we, therefore, merely add, that the work, with all its faults, is well worth perusal, and that many of the statements and suggestions it contains are deserving the attention of missionary societies.

W. A.

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada. By Mrs. Jameson, author of "Characteristics of Women," &c. New York: Wiley and Putnam. 1839. — No English writer of our day has a finer sense of the beautiful, whether in nature or art, than the author of "Characteristics of Women." She has probably done more than any one else of late to diffuse a taste for the fine arts. Her studies have been given to the master-spirits in poetry and elegant letters, and her travels have made her acquainted with the principal artists of the age, and with the masterpieces of ancient and modern genius.

The work before us, giving an account of her studies and rambles in a Canadian winter and summer, is one of the most agreeable, though probably the least elaborate, of her productions.

A Canadian winter, as might well be supposed, struck rather harshly upon the frame of one, accustomed to the milder skies of Europe, and all the luxuries of European life; and the kind of society, in which she found herself at Toronto, did not tend to check her home-sickness, or quiet the longing for more congenial shores, which a spirit so habituated to an atmosphere of poetry and art must feel in a new and rough colonial settlement. And, accordingly, we find that she turned her thoughts to her old studies, and she gives us the results of her reveries and reading in the form of criticisms on various works of art, and takes especial delight in dwelling upon the genius of Goethe, from whose memoirs, by Ekermann, she furnishes copious and most interesting extracts. The view she takes of his personal character is far higher than is common with persons, who have been his critics. If her estimate of him be correct, there is less reason than many allege to distinguish so carefully the literary and private character of the man. Some of his sayings upon religion, as quoted by Mrs. Jameson, are such as to free him from the oft-repeated charge of total indifference, and to add to the conviction, which all, who have read his description of the religious experience of the Fair Saint in Wilhelm Meister, cannot but entertain, that the bard of Weimar could not have been an irreligious man.

Occasionally, indeed, Mrs. Jameson found some charms in a Canadian winter, to draw her away from her books. Her description of her excursion in a snow-storm to Niagara, and her first view of the Falls, shows that her poetic taste is not confined exclusively to the criticism of books.

But in summer, her spirit breaks forth from winter seclusion with delight, and in the account of her excursion up Lake Huron, her sketches of scenery, and life, especially Indian life, make the second part of her work remarkably interesting. Much as she mourns over the degraded state of the Indians, she finds poetry even among them, and gives us some songs and allegories, which show, that the spirit of beauty is indeed everywhere.

She appears to look with less pity upon the Indian women than is usual with travellers, and says, that hunting is so arduous, that it must needs take all the care and time of the men, and, therefore, the women are obliged to perform the household, and much of the farming labor. She deems it rather an honor to

them, that they can be so useful, and appears to make a contrast between their usefulness, and the listless, petted lives of English women, which is in no way complimentary to the latter. This subject of female character and duty is more largely treated, than any other in the book. In all she says of woman's true destiny, and actual condition, there is a strain of melancholy, that implies her own existence has not run as smoothly, as could be wished. But she complains so prettily, that the strain is pleasant, and the reader is ready to say with Fazio: —

> "Ay, chide on;
> The nightingale's complaining is more sweet
> Than half the dull, unvarying birds, that pipe
> Perpetual joy."

The Moral Teacher; designed as a Class-Book for the Common Schools in the United States of America. By a CLERGYMAN. New-York; Robinson & Franklin. 1839. 12mo. pp. 196. — A want long felt is here at length supplied, and exceedingly well supplied. If our ideal of a volume of Christian morality is not fully realized, but little is wanting, and that little, perhaps, ought not to be, for one's ideal is ever apt to go beyond nature and possibility. Let a beginning be made with this, and then, if a better be needed, a better will soon come to take its place. There should no longer be any delay in making the subjects which it treats a part of common school education, and of education in every school. We shall look by-and-by with astonishment at the fact, that, at so late a period of the world as the present, Christian communities like ours were content, that their children should receive all other instruction in the public school, while their moral and religious education, — the education of the conscience, — was wholly neglected. In the reforms which are now attempting, we trust that the monstrous solecism of schools in a Christian land, which on principle exclude Christianity, will be "reformed altogether." We congratulate the author on having succeeded perfectly, — where to succeed has been deemed a thing impossible, — in so setting forth the eternal principles of morals, and of universal religion, as at the same time that he unfolds them clearly and sufficiently, never to confound them with, or make them to be deduced from, the peculiar religious opinions of any sect. To those, who have doubted the possibility of teaching Christian morality in our schools, separately from Christian doctrine, and have, on that ground, opposed its introduction, believing that it would be but a cover for the introduction of sectarian Christianity, we recommend the perusal of this

little volume. They will here find the sum and substance of Christian morality, without a single instance of the inculcation, directly or indirectly, of any theological peculiarity.

The author has been eminently successful, it seems to us also, in overcoming another difficulty; that, namely, of presenting the various points of moral philosophy in a form to be clearly apprehended by the young; either in language so simple and perspicuous, or accompanied by such illustrations and examples, that scarce any child of the age for which the compend is designed, can fail to understand them. But, while it is thus adapted to the capacities of young learners, there is enough left for their minds to grapple with. They are aided, but the work is not done for them. And as the volume advances toward its close, the demand upon the pupil, as it should, increases. It will be found, we are persuaded, to form a capital text-book, not only for public and private schools, but for family instruction, and for Sunday School teaching. It is filled with topics, — of which an outline is just given, — of most useful and agreeable discussion, either for children with one another, or with their parents, or teachers. The present treatise, the author has prepared for children of "from eight to twelve years of age." This should be borne in mind by those who examine it. We hope he will feel himself encouraged to go on in the preparation of another volume, "still needed," as he suggests, "for the higher classes in our schools." The work could hardly be committed to a more competent hand.

Discourses preached in the New North Church, December 9th, on the completion of the 124th year from the establishment of the Church, and of the 25th year since the settlement of the present pastor. By Francis Parkman, D. D. Boston. 1839. These discourses, delivered on the Sunday which completed the 25th year of the settlement of their author, must be peculiarly interesting to the members of his society, from the rapid and comprehensive sketch they present of their past history, running through a period of an hundred and twenty-four years; and they are valuable to our community, as constituting important material for the future ecclesiastical historian. They bear upon them distinctive marks of their parentage, in the deep seriousness which pervades them, — relieved here and there by a certain "half-apparent humor," — and in that strong attachment to what is venerable by reason of years and long use, which loves to dwell on the times, the customs, and virtues of the past. Although, however, the author is a lover of the times that are gone,

and of institutions which are hung about with the honors of a grey antiquity, and is no friend of the changes which come with almost every seventh wave of the rolling tide of time, yet is he no bigot in his faith, nor any slave of tradition, but has an eye for the faults and errors of those who have gone before, as well as of those who are now, evident enough in the following paragraph, which we commend to the reader.

"He that shall survey their ecclesiastical annals, [our Fathers',] and observe how often the weak or the fallen were called to judgment; how often the brethren aggrieved appealed to sister churches for redress from the brethren offending; how one council was opposed to another council, and censures and monitions, suspensions and excommunications, were reciprocally interchanged, will be compelled to acknowledge, that our fathers realized but imperfectly the communion of the saints; that whatever may have been their reverence for God, they had not learnt from their Master, compassion for the ignorant, and them out of the way. If we, their children, have lost somewhat of that zeal for God, which was thus jealous for his ordinances, we have learnt, perhaps, something of the charity, which endureth, because it hopeth all things. And amidst a due sense of unworthiness and the humility becoming us, we shall not be solicitous to inquire, why the former days were better than these, for the experience of Solomon conspires with our own, to teach us, that we may not inquire wisely concerning this. — pp. 29, 30.

The Monthly Miscellany of Religion and Letters. — A new religious periodical has been started under the above name, conducted by the Rev. Cazneau Palfrey. The prospectus has been for some time before the public, and we need not repeat its contents. It has our heartiest good wishes for its success, and we see not, when we think of the numbers constituting the Unitarian body, why it should not succeed. There is room for it, and to spare. The numbers, thus far, are both able and interesting. It appears on the first of every month, in an 8vo pamphlet of 48 pages, at three dollars per annum, in advance.

INDEX.

A.

Address and poem before the Mercantile Library Association, noticed, 266.

American Education, by Rev. B. O. Peers, and Home Education, by Isaac Taylor, reviewed, 162 — essential features in an American national education, 164 — moral and religious instruction in schools, 165 *et seq.* — Taylor's style remarked upon, 168 — his principle of late development, *ib.* — prefers private to public education, 170 — opposed by the reviewer, *ib.* — three eras of early life, 171 - 174 — analysis of intellectual faculties, 175 — value and power of the education of home, 177 - 179.

Andrews, William, obituary notice of, 132.

Atonement, Onderdonk on the, noticed, 271.

Auburn and Pennsylvania systems of prison discipline, examined, 61.

B.

Ballantynes, Scott's connexion with them, remarks on, 113, 114.

Brant, Joseph, life of, by William L. Stone, 137 — remarks on the title, 138 — Indian eloquence, 139 - 142 — duties and labors of the American historian, 143 - 151 — Brant's connexion with the Wyoming affair, 153, 154 — Indians defended against the usual charges of cruelty, 155 — their sufferings at the hands of the whites, 156, 157 — anecdote of Indian humanity, 158 — style of the author, 161.

Brazer, Rev. Dr., his notice of the death of Rev. William Andrews, 132.

Burr's, Aaron, Journal, noticed, 267.

C.

Campbellites, in the West, their numbers and labors, 28.

Campbell, the poet, his injustice to the Indian Brant, 153.

Catholic missionaries in China, 386.

Carpenter, Dr., his Harmony of the Gospels, the second edition, noticed, 135.

Cellerier, father and son, 319 — the work of the son on the laws of Moses, 322 — much wanted among the Unitarians of Geneva, 322 — yet not sectarian, *ib.* — plan of the work, 323 — its lucid order, 324 — compared with Michaelis's laws of Moses, 325 — the faith of the author in the divine authority of Moses, 327 — extended abstract of the work given, 328 - 339.

Channing, W. E., Lecture on War, 270 — Remarks on Slavery, in a Letter to Jonathan Phillips, 272 — his eulogium on Cardinal Cheverus, quoted, 96.

Character and genius of Scott, 101.

Cheverus, Cardinal, Life of, by J. Huen-Dubourg, reviewed, 88 — the work full of exaggeration and error, 89 — of the two translations, the Boston preferred, 90 — sketch given of the life of Cheverus; born Jan. 28, 1768, died

July 19, 1836, 92 — at the age of twelve, dedicated himself to God, his spirit of self-sacrifice, his economy, his charity, 93, 94 — recalled to France 1823, 95 — Dr. Channing's character of him quoted, 96 — his simplicity of character and warmth of feeling, 97 — compared with Fenelon, 98 — his reluctance to take office, 99.
Christ's moral character, the power of, 273 — the character of our religion determined by the view we take of Christ, *ib.* — the tendency since the apostolic age has been to make the metaphysical view of Christ the chief thing, 274 — evil results of this, 275 — the reasons which induce us to esteem chiefly the moral character of Christ, 276 - 290.
Christian citizen, the, 290.
Clarkson's strictures on a life of William Wilberforce, 191 — extract, 192 — charge against him by the sons of Mr. Wilberforce, *ib.*
Congress of nations, as a means of preserving peace, objected to, 186 *et seq.*
Copyright, perpetual right of, shown, 50, 51.
Cuba, description of the principal fruits of, by F. W. P. Greenwood, 259.

D.

Davis's, Matthew L., private journal of Aaron Burr, 267.
Discourses, by Francis Parkman, D. D., 407.
Dwight's translations from Goethe and Schiller, 360.

E.

Editorial notice, 136.
Education, remarks on the true object of, 106 - 108 — works on, reviewed, 162.
Ellis, Mrs., her work on the women of England, 264.
Eloquence, Indian, 139 - 143.
Emigration to the West, reasons for, 18.
Ethics, political, Dr. Lieber's work on, 31.
Expediency, doctrine of, defined and discussed, 46 *et seq.*

F.

Fireside education, by the author of Peter Parley's tales, 266.
Frothingham, Rev. N. L., his version of Schiller's Indian deathsong, 376.

G.

Geneva, modern reform in, 319.
German literary intelligence, 267 - 269.
Goethe, his character as a writer and a man, 361 - 368.
Gray's, Frederick T., address at the Odeon, 262.
Grant, Mrs., of Laggan, obituary notice of, republished from the Edinburgh Courant, 127 - 132.
Greenwood's description of the principal fruits of Cuba, 259.

H.

Harmony of the Gospels, Dr. Carpenter's, noticed, 135.
Hawaiian Spectator, noticed and commended, 122.
Hebrews, characteristics of as a people, 329.
Herschel, Sir John, 336 — his translation of Schiller's Indian deathsong, 376.
Hobbes, his purpose in the Leviathan, 42.
Home education, by Isaac Taylor, 162.
Huen-Dubourg's Life of Cardinal Cheverus, reviewed, 88.

I

Illinois and the West, by A. D. Jones, reviewed; the work briefly characterized, 17 — reasons for emigration to the West, 18 — country described, 19 — condition of settlers, 22 — their moral circumstances, and duty of Christian philanthropists, 27 — Campbellites and Catholics, 28 — establishment of a theological school in the West, opposed, 29 *et seq.*

Infidelity, historical sketch of it, 82.

J.

Jameson, Mrs., her Winter Studies and Summer Rambles, 404.
Jones, A. D., his work on Illinois and the West, reviewed, 18.

L.

Lieber's Manual of Political Ethics, 32 — the publication happily timed, *ib.* — expectation from it disappointed, 38 — defects pointed out, 38 - 40 — the work divided into two books, the first treating of morals, the second of society, 42 — the first meagre and unsatisfactory, *ib.* — contains no peculiar doctrines in ethics, *ib.* — elements of a theory of morals, 43, 44 — the doctrine of expediency defined and argued, 46, 47 — remarks on the second book, 48 — the institution of property prematurely discussed, 49 — extract on the question of copyright, *ib.* — the right of perpetual copyright defended, 50, 51 — the author returns to the question, what is the State, *ib.* — vaguely defined, *ib.* — general expediency the motive for the institution of government, 52 — concluding remarks on the work, 53, 54.
Lunatic hospital at Worcester, 247 — results of efforts, 247, 248 — causes of insanity, 248 — masturbation, 250 - 253 — intemperance, 253 — public worship, 253 - 256 — hospital needs enlargement, 257 - 259.

M.

Malcom's travels in the East, 378 — his spirit of Christian charity toward the nations he visited, 379 — a just discrimination in his estimate of the Pagan character and religion, 383 — manifests a spirit of illiberality toward the liberal Hindoos of Calcutta, and the Catholics of China, 385 — instance respecting the latter, 386, 387 — extract concerning the liberal Hindoos and Rammohun Roy, 387 - 390 — errors in it pointed out, 391 — the religious faith of Rammohun Roy, *ib.* — his efforts in behalf of education, 393 — the author's charge that Rammohun Roy did nothing for the Hindoo women, examined and refuted, 395 - 397 — activity and zeal of Rammohun Roy and the liberal Hindoos in plans of moral and social improvement, 402.
Man, a religious being, 77 — religious principle, innate and peculiar to man, 78, 79 — objections considered, 80 — historical sketch of infidelity in France, Germany, and our own country, 81 *et seq.*
Married Life, Sketches of, noticed, 126.
More, Dr. Henry, his life by Richard Ward, reviewed, 1 — More's early life, 2, 3 — a mystic, 3 — his poem called Psychozia, his contemporaries and learning, 4, 5 — character of his religion, 9 — his writings not destined to be popular, 11 — his personal habits, 12 — reverence of conscience, 12, 13 — his belief in ghosts, witches, &c., 16 — his character briefly sketched, 16, 17.
Monthly Miscellany of Religion and Letters, 408.
Moral character of Christ, its power illustrated, 273 - 290.
Moral rule of political action, a discourse, by J. Pierpont, 218.
Moral Teacher, the, by a clergyman, 406.
Mosaic Laws, Cellerier's Spirit of the, 319.

O.

Onderdonk's, Right Rev. Henry, charge, 271.

P.

Peace and Peace Societies, article on, 179 — origin of Peace Societies, 180.
Peers, Benj. O., his work on American Education, reviewed, 162.

Pierpont's discourse, moral rule of political action, 218 — political conduct of men a proper subject of preaching, 218 - 221.
Poem, by James T. Field, before the Mercantile Library Association, 266.
Poetry of Travelling in the United States, 267.
Political Ethics 32 — great questions of, stated, *ib.* — the new position of the science, 33 — popular consent as the sole foundation of government, a mere fiction, 33, 34 — government rests on the eternal laws of justice, and natural right, and allegiance, therefore a moral duty, 35.
Presbyterian Church Case, 344.
Prison discipline, article on, 54 — object of punishment, 55 — early movements towards reform, 56 — Boston Prison Discipline Society, organized June 30, 1825, 57.

R.

Rammohun Roy, unfairness of Malcom toward him and the liberal Hindoos of Calcutta, exposed, 397 *et seq.*
Revelation, the nature and proper evidences of, 222 — distinction stated between the philosophy of religion and the feeling of it, *ib.* — discussion of the nature and evidences of a revelation belongs to the philosophy of Christianity, 223 — the only essential faith that of the heart, 224 — the discussion, nevertheless, of utmost importance, 225 — supernatural aid essential to the idea of a revelation, 226.
Ripley's Specimen of Foreign Standard Literature, vol. III., 360.

S.

Sandford's, Mrs. John, Woman in her Social and Domestic Character, noticed, 135.
Sandwich Islands, decrease of the native population of, 123.
Schiller and Goethe compared, 361 — the character of Schiller's mind and writings, 373 - 376.
Scott, remarks on the character and genius of, 101 — biography and history contrasted, 101, 102 — Scott's childhood, 102 — his lameness, 104 — not eminent in classical studies, 105 — remarks on the true object in education, 106 - 108 — brief sketch of his literary career, 109.
Slavery, 301 — tendency to extreme opinions, *ib.* — attempt to take a middle ground, *ib.* — slavery compared with other conditions of men, 302, 303 — the evils of these conditions removable but slowly, 303 - 306 — so with slavery, 306 — what is slavery in the United States? *ib.* — slaves generally speaking well treated, 307 — but exposed to great evils, 308.
Stone, W. L., his life of Brant, reviewed, 137.

T.

Taylor's, Isaac, Home Education, reviewed, 162.

U.

Unitarianism in Geneva, 319 - 322.

V.

Voltaire and Goethe compared, 363.

W.

Walsh, Robert M., his translation of Huen-Dubourg's life of Cheverus, noticed, 91.
Ward, Richard, his life of Dr. Henry More, reviewed, 1.
War, defensive, justifiable, 101.
Whitman's, Jason, Young Lady's Aid to Usefulness and Happiness, noticed and commended, 136.
Wilberforce, William, Life of, by his sons, reviewed, 191.
Wilhelm Meister, its moral, 363.
Woman as she should be, &c., by Rev. Hubbard Winslow, also, Woman in her Social and Domestic Character, by Mrs. John Sandford, noticed, 135.
Worcester Lunatic Asylum, 247.